PHILOSOPHY

A Short Introduction

Telugu Original
RANGANAYAKAMMA

English Translation
R. Udaykumar
Professor, Jawaharlal Nehru Centre for Advanced Scientific Research, Bangalore

&

Kodidela Mamatha
Software Engineer, USA

Copy Editing:
B.R. Bapuji
Formerly Professor, University of Hyderabad

SWEET HOME PUBLICATIONS
76, Lake-side Colony, Jubilee Hills post,
HYDERABAD – 500 033

SHOUT
SHARE
IT

PHILOSOPHY
A Short Introduction
By Ranganayakamma

First Print: June, 2019

Pages: 320
Price: Rs. 100

Page Makeup:
T. Rakesh Varma

Printing:
Charita Impressions,
1-19-1126/B,
Azamabad Industrial Estate,
Hyderabad-500020.
[Phone: 040-27678411]

For Copies:
Sweet Home Publications,
76, Lakeside Colony,
Durgam Cheruvu Area,
Jubilee Hills post,
Hyderabad-500033.
(Mobile: 9948283810)
Email: brbapuji@gmail.com

Writer's Address:
Ranganayakamma,
76, Lakeside Colony,
Durgam Cheruvu Area,
Jubilee Hills post,
Hyderabad-500033.
Email: brbapuji@gmail.com
www.ranganayakamma.org

CONTENTS

Foreword - 6

A Note on Translation - 9

1. Some books are not comprehensible.....11
2. Philosophy is a boring subject 14
3. What is Philosophy? What is the difference between Natural Sciences and Philosophy?.....20
4. Creationism and Idealism 27
5. Materialism 33
6. Humans after the Earth or Earth after the Human.....35
7. Wont the questions on 'creator' and 'universal spirit' also arise on 'Naturally existing Matter"? 40
8. Can we understand the universe?.....48
9. The Philosophers of before Christ 55
10. The Modern Philosophers too fail to see society 63
11. Philosophers who fascinated Marx and Engels 73
12. The history of 'The Holy Family' 86
13. Dialectical Materialism 88
14. Laws of Dialectics 91
15. Hegel's First Law of Dialectics: Change in Quality with change in Quantity 97

16. On 'Contradictions' 105

17. Hegel's Second Law of Dialectics:
Unity and Contradiction of Opposites 111

18. Hegel's Third Law of Dialectics:
Negation of Negation 115

19. Why did Marx and Engels like Hegel's Laws so much? 120

20. To what extent Hegel's Laws are applicable to society? 121

21. Hegel had ruled Philosophy! 127

22. How smart Materialists women are! 130

23. Hegel cannot be the teacher of Marx! 134

24. What is the difference between Hegel's Logic
and Marx's Logic? 136

25. What will be after Communism? 139

26. Perpetual development in society
is irrational development 143

27. A few more ideas of Hegel 146

28. "All that real is rational, All that rational is real!" 154

29. Philosophy, good to have it,
much better not to have it! 163

30. Correct Materialism 167

31. Space and Time: Are they Matters?
Do they exist or not? 173

32. The time-pass Philosophies
of Y*Ellayya*s and *Pullayya*s
(Tom, Dick and Harry-s) 180

33. Does Marxism mean Hegelianism? 188

34. Stalin on Dialectics 192

35. Mao on Dialectics 196

36. What does 'Quality' mean?
What does 'Form' mean? 206

37. The 'Philosophy of poverty' and
the'Poverty of Philosophy.....214

38. On 'Human History'.....221

39. Historical Materialism 224

40. The Revolutionary Dictatorship of the Proletariat! 229

41. How should the 'Exploitative Division of Labor' change?....236

42. Some more changes in the Communist society 252

43. The Marxist theory of Knowledge
(Marxist Epistemology) 263

44. Marxists who are unconcerned with Marxism!.....271

45. Proletariat with 'muck of all ages'! 278

46. 'Existence' determines 'Consciousness'.....289

47. Mutually contradictory Philosophies! 293

48. Need to see few more things 299

INDEX 318

FOREWORD

(To the first Telugu edition)

I have never had any interest in Philosophy. Not that I did not read those books in the past. We would certainly like it if what we read is easily understood and if there is any good point. If we cannot understand what we read, there won't be any scope to know whether it is good or not and how much good is there in it. I can't say how I read Philosophy essays in the past but I held the view that it was waste of time. Not that my view has now changed completely.

Six months ago, I read a collection of Philosophy essays with which I came across unexpectedly. It was somewhat intelligible. I got very angry. Then I thought, 'let me see what Philosophy is. Why should I leave it aside without looking at it?' When searched in the house, I found 7 or 8 books on Philosophy. I noticed some comments which I wrote with pencil on the covers of those books. A comment on the cover of a book read like this: 'I read this. I read this. I swear if I understood it.' A comment on another book: 'I should not touch this book again! I should be clever!' A comment on yet another book: 'The time which we lost won't come back'. Similar irritating comments were there on the remaining books. But on one particular book, I noticed the comment: 'Pity, this book is somewhat good.' I felt as if my heart stopped beating.

Then I thought, 'I took out all these books with an intention to read, didn't I? What should I do now? Perhaps I wrote that comment then as I could not understand them properly! Should I read them now or not? Why should I waste space in the almirahs for such books which need not be read? This time I should and will read carefully *keeping all my senses in order*.'

I thought at length on that day, removed all my old comments on the books with an eraser, struck of those comments with pen which could not be erased and kept that handful of books beside me. In every book, there is a list of books which the author read in order to write that book. After going through those lists of readings, I found it essential to secure 10 more books for my reading. I got them in a few days. Relevant dictionaries are also

available at home.

Those essays on Philosophy were not the original writings of Philosophers. They were Telugu translations of English essays in which the essayists summarized the original writings of the Philosophers. Those Telugu translations in fact were highly Sanskritized.

Whatever book we open, we need to take the help of a dictionary at every page. If we close the book for a while due to some interruption and reopen it after an hour, we would be unable to remember upto what point we have read. When we go back too far and start reading the already read pages once again, those pages too appear as new unread pages. No page gives an impression that we have already read it. They appear alike even when read them third time or seventh time. The problem is not entirely with the language. The subject matter itself is like that. The manner of writing itself is like that.

In every book and at every page, I used to wonder, 'should working class people and students read these writings and this language!' Whenever I finished reading a book, I used to feel, 'Oh, I have unnecessarily erased my comments which I wrote on the cover. It is again waste of time! Waste of time!'

I have once again scribbled as it came to my mind: 'Life is short', 'How much life is left for me! Should I spend it like this?', 'I will not waste my short life like this'. I wrote my comments like this with a view that I would erase it, strike it of later if necessary. Only then my anger subsided.

I did not at all have the intention to write something about Philosophy before I started reading those books. Except curiousity to peep into that subject for a while, I did not have anything more.

After four or five weeks when I started jotting down some notes for my understanding, it gradually took the present form.

I think so many writers we find in the field of Philosophy will not be there in any other fields. I don't know whether this is true or not.

Some translators of Philosophy books give the meanings of certain terms in parentheses when citing the words of a particular

Philosopher. Not all translators do so. And not at every place. While summarizing they explain in whatever way they understood those terms. One would not say as the other did. For the word '*pilli*' (cat) one gives '*maarjaalam*' while another gives '*bidaalam*' (Telugized words with Sanskrit origin, meaning 'cat') as translation equivalents. Truly speaking, this is a sort of *feat on the sword* (=Herculean task) for the translators. The translators too must have experienced lot of torture in the work of translation.

It is imperative on my part to clarify about the quotations that I cited here and there in this book. I retained some quotations as they were. I presented some quotations by modifying few words so as to make them easily understandable. I have also added 'lengthening of the final vowels (at the end of every noun if there are more than one noun in order to express coordinator markers like 'and', and 'or'), case suffixes (for every noun if there are more than one), commas and the like wherever necessary. If such modifications were not made, there won't be any question of intelligibility.

'Men, women and students belonging to the working class ought to read this book. I kept only these readers in view. Books meant for these readers should be written in an easily under-standable manner. Otherwise, there won't be any use if not written so.

This is merely small attempt at introducing Philosophies that have been in existence since pre-Christian era.

The list of books which I read for writing this book is given at the end. Most of those books are available in book shops or libraries. One must read at least few books. If they wish they can write their comments on the covers of those books. They, however, will have such facility only if the books are their own.

Why should we be totally unaware of what Philosophy is and what its history is. It is good to know something about it, isn't it? Now, I have rectified my mistake of not allowing it to *fall on my ears*. It is certainly necessary to have some amount of acquaintance with Philosophy. We will know to what extent it is necessary for the society.

Ranganayakamma
3-2-2014

★

A Note on Translation

This translation is based on the Telugu original, ***Tatva Sastram*** (*Philosophy*), which appeared first in April 2014 and underwent three editions subsequently.

R. Udaykumar has translated 31 chapters (Nos. 1-12, 23-40) while **Kodidela Mamatha** translated 13 chapters (Nos.13-22, 43, 44 & 48). The remaining 4 chapters (Nos. 41, 45-47) are slightly modified versions of my earlier translations present in *An Introduction to Marx's 'Capita*l' by the same authoress.

Once the translation of a chapter was over, I compared the translation,sentence by sentence, with the Telugu original and made modifications wherever I felt necessary, after discussing with the original writer. **Our main concern and priority have been not merely reproducing the essential meaning of the original text but also the individual style of the original writer.** (*By style, we mean the specific manner in which the writer presents her ideas, intentions, attitudes and so on.*) In this process, there might have occurred some

changes, which may not retain or indicate the English proficiency and the translation abilities of the respective translators fully. However, before beginning the translation, they had generously agreed to tolerate my interference. I justify my interference with the help of the concept of 'World Englishes', which imply that one can allow the influence of the First or the Source language substratum including the nature of the style of the writer while translating.

The present copyedited translation may still have shortcomings due to the limitations of my English proficiency and or my orientation toward the process of translating. Hence, I am responsible, not the translators, for the shortcomings that may still remain.

A clarification: We have not given the list of references which the original writer gave because they include mostly Telugu translations of English books. We, however, gave bibliographic details of the citations in the main body of the text.

B.R. Bapuji

June, 2019

★

1. Some books are not comprehensible!

When we read a book, if the contents of the book are not comprehensible, there could be at least four reasons for such incomprehensiveness. It does not mean that all the four reasons coexist in a given context. There may be only one reason or two reasons. The following are the four reasons.

1. The writer's attempt to tell something that is 'not factual': Let us assume that the writer is attempting to tell (write) about 'God.' The 'God' is something that does not exist in 'Nature'. Something not 'factual'. It is merely a belief or imagination. It is something that cannot be logically explained. However much strongly a devotee may believe in god and however much effectively he may communicate, he cannot explain the concept of god with proofs. However much properly a person attempts to explain, it is not possible for him to make another person grasp such things which do not exist in Nature and which are unreal. If the other person also is a devotee, only a believer, then, there is a concurrence between the first devotee who is conveying (writing) and the second devotee who is receiving (reading or listening). As such books contain the miracles and beliefs that the devotees seek, the devotees will not face the question that "the book is not comprehensible." Only those people who try to understand something logically will face the problem of incomprehensive- ness with the books of devotion.

Not only God, it also would not be possible to make it comprehensible, by writing or speaking, regarding any other issue non-existing in Nature. The listeners or readers must believe in it; that is the only alternative. However, 'to believe' is not to understand. Therefore, 'the inherent defect' of the content constitutes one reason that makes the writing incomprehensive.

2. Saying something without knowing the content properly, although the content is factual: The content is real, and it is scientific. Zoology, Botany, Astronomy or the other - it is a discipline of science. However, if a person who lacks proper knowledge of the subject writes a book on the topic, the book will not be able to make that science compre-hensible. That means a writer cannot make others understand something which he himself does not know. His attempt to write that science will make his readers understand one thing very clear as follows: "This gentleman has absolutely no idea of what he would like to communicate."

3. The person knows the subject well but lacks the writing skill: There ought to be proper order and logic while writing. The writer knows everything, but cannot write. Why does a person who knows things well cannot write? Because a verbal statement is something different from putting the same thing in writing. When interacting face to face, the listeners will instantly ask questions, and the speaker will promptly clarify the questions. The listeners will understand things easily at every step. Whereas while writing the same matter, the writer will have to guess in advance the possible questions that arise in the minds of the readers and write accordingly with a suitable clarification. Not only this, the language is a problem while writing. While talking, there won't be bookish language. While writing, many writers strive to communicate in a 'scholarly' language. They presume that the language of writing should be that way. They do not simply 'presume', they 'consider' that the language should be that way. And they fill the pages with such a language.

While trying to read any of the books on the communist theory, many people would say, "Dear me! What words are these? Cannot understand them," The problem is not with the words such as 'the landlord' or 'the bourgeoisie'. Although such terms are new to the ears of the people, once introduced,

the words will become familiar. There is no problem with such words. The real problem is with the scholarly Telugu phrases like *'anumida gnanam', 'nigama-nopapatti'* etc.! Phrases such as these are not one, two or five. Throughout all pages, the sentence after sentence proceeds like that. After opening the book, the readers will be thoroughly demoralized, having to face with forty-six incomprehensive words within a length of five to six pages. The readers would close the book before passing the ninth page and set the book aside calmly. If they open the book again, unable to suppress the affection for the book, they will toss the book farther away impatiently before turning the third page. Again interest vanishes. They would beg for the forgiveness of the book. Unless the writing is simple, this fate is imminent, regardless of how enthusiastic the reader may be. Then, how will that person know the contents of the book?

The language in the books of theory must flow into the head of the reader as smoothly as the drinking water flows down his throat. The content of the book is for the reader, not for the display of the scholar-ship of the writer. Unless the writer has such a disposition, regardless of how valuable the content is, the book will be useless, won't it be? Doubtless, the book is bound to be wasted.

4. Low level of the perception of the reader: The contents of the book are good. The language is simple. The writing style is elegant, progressing logically and clarifying the doubts. Nevertheless, the reader fails to understand. The reason for this is reader's limitation itself. The reader may not be habituated to reading, lack of interest in the book held in the arms, above all, the compelling laziness – thus, there can be many reasons. In a context such as this, the reader, not the writer, is at fault. Thus, these are the four reasons that make the books incomprehensive.

★

2. Philosophy is a boring subject!

The question of unintelligibility does not arise with regard to books of fiction, such as the stories and novels, irrespective of how they are written. Even if a story is not understood, there is no great harm done. The problem is with the theoretical essays. Even there, there is no problem with the essays related to the natural science, if the language is simple. The real problem is with the books of Philosophy! When we find the word 'Philosophy' on the face of the book, we feel that 'this book is meant for the scholars, not for us.' The very word 'Philosophy' at the outset will scare us immensely. Can't these people find a simpler word for this discipline?

'That is his Philosophy' if we recall these words that we use while referring to someone's Nature, perhaps there is no need to be frightened so much regarding 'Philosophy.' Even if not frightened, the word 'Philosophy' doesn't relish good to us in the least (at least to me). This word sounds like some 'religious term'. In spite of not liking the term, if one manages to enter the book, the contents should be compre-hensible, so that one should feel that "this is what Philosophy is!' One does not feel so. Moreover, one will think, 'Alas, why to bother.'

Even without reading any books of Philosophy, but hearing the proverbs in the routine life, we may consider that philosophies, in reality, are our own views.

The loose talk that the *Pullayya*s and *Ellayya*s (= proper names used to refer to uninformed, illiterate village folks in Telugu situation. Like Tom, Dick and Harry in English) indulge in while sitting on the verandas of the houses and puffing off the cigars, all such chatter could be qualified as philosophical tenets. When *Ellayya* says to *Pullyya*, "*Brother-in-law*! We cannot take a bath in the same river twice, the water keeps flowing forward,

doesn't it?" then, it makes a great philosophical doctrine. At home, when a maternal grand-mother says to the paternal grand-mother, "*Sister-in-law, without the order from Lord Shiva, even an ant will not bite*" then, this utterance becomes another great philosophical axiom!

Around us, out there, there are many elements, the trees and the ant hills, the hills and the valleys, the sun and the moon, the clouds and the sky, the crows and the parrots, and the dogs and the foxes, and many more. All of these and us make 'Nature'. That is 'the world'. That is where all of us are in. As we, all the human beings, living in a variety of labour relations and familial relations constitute 'the human society.' All of the human society exists encompassed within Nature, doesn't it?

Since the early part of the life, every person would have formed some views regarding the world and the human society encompassed within the world. Regarding the world, 'The God created the world and guarding it,' and regarding the society, 'The society is very pious one,' and, many such views must have been formed. All these views have taken a shape due to the influence of the parents, the outsiders, and the lessons at the school. Some views among them could be wrong, and a few others could be right (the wrong views are more, of course). As a person grows and is exposed to more experiences, the opinions formed at the younger age may change to some extent or, alternatively, the same early views may be consolidated.

If there are a thousand people in a village, all those thousand people need not necessarily have a thousand different views. All of them will have a single view or views of two or three types.

If all the thousand people have the view on 'Nature' that, 'there is God,' then, this is one Philosophy. Instead, if two of them have a different view that, 'there is no God,' then, this is a different Philosophy. Or, if one of these two persons bears an alternative view that, 'How can we know whether or not there is a God? Can we understand this? Why should we bother regarding

this?' then, this will be the third Philosophy.

The same thing applies to 'the society' as well. 'This society is great. Very great. This society must remain as it is,' such a view is one Philosophy. Another Philosophy: 'This society is rotting. This society must be burned. To use a Hindi expression '*jalaado jalaado yeh duniya*' ('burn this world').

'There is good in this society and also bad. Both the elements are true. Even if you change this system, will not the new society become like this again? Can good exist without bad?' this is the third Philosophy. A few philosophies occupy both the positions stepping into both the domains. Regardless of how many new views may emerge, each of them views must fall into one of these three categories of philosophies.

When we read the word 'Philosophy' on the face of a book, it does not mean that it represents 'a great truth' or 'a great science.' The contents of the book could be correct or useless or a blend of both. The logic of the book will be in accordance with the Philosophy of the book. A correct one will have a correct logic, a wrong one will have a wrong logic, and a vacillating one will have a vacillating logic.

Why do people hold wrong views? It is because, in an era when the facts are not known, all the people hold wrong notions. In an era, when the people were not aware of the fact that 'the earth revolves around the sun,' all people had the notion that 'the sun revolves around the earth', hadn't they? This was not the fault of any single person. Nevertheless, that was a wrong notion. After that, when a few scientists grasped the actual fact and exposed the wrong conception and proclaimed, 'it is not the sun that revolves around the earth, it is the earth that revolves around the sun,' what did the clergy do? Instead of congratulating the scientists on the discovery of the truth, the clergy burned the scientists at stake. Why? Won't the people stop believing in the erroneous teachings of the clergy if the truths such as this kept unfolding? That means the clergy enjoy certain benefits if the

people are engrossed in erroneous beliefs! The leaders seek these benefits and do not care for the truth! The sun must revolve around the earth, for the sake of their benefit. **Giordano Bruno** (1548-1600), an Italian scientist, was burned alive in the hands of these tormenters for refusing to change his proclamation that 'the earth revolves around the sun'! A religious leader called **John Calvin** (1509-1564) executed a Spanish scientist **Michael Servetus** (1511-1553) who discovered the system of blood circulation, by impaling him first, and then burning him alive! The religious people persecuted the Philosophers and the scientists by subjecting them to cruel torture. Why could the Almighty God not protect the innocent people? When a cruelty of this Nature is perpe- trated, how much contempt and indignation one must feel against the religious autocrats!

First of all, what is the reason underlying the wrong ideas in the society?

(1) 'The facts' are not known. Everyone holds the wrong ideas.

(2) The facts are known. However, the wrongs are beneficial to some. The beneficiaries perpetuate the wrongs.

These are the two reasons that ensure that the wrongs are established and sustained. If fact, the people who can perceive the wrongs with the utmost clarity cannot cherish the wrong ideas. They abandon the wrong ideas. Only the people of the second category who benefit by the wrong ideas will strive to embrace and to defend these ideas much more steadfastly.

In spite of simplifying and reducing the meaning of the term 'Philosophy' to 'an idea' or 'a view', the term 'Philosophy' is still a very vexing word. Although I have never stopped to read available essays related to Philosophy, I did not consider it necessary to know Philosophy. When the readers asked me if I had written anything on Philosophy, I used to say, "Other than seeing few references in *Capital* here and there, I haven't studied Philosophy with special interest. I am not interested in it. However, whenever someone raised this issue, I used to tell

myself firmly, "Let me give a serious reading to the topic this time." Then I used to take the books out, dust them off, keep them within reach, and again put them back on the shelves by the evening – this is what has always been happening. If I wrote a chapter titled 'Marxism is not only Economics but also Philosophy' in my '*introduction to Marx's capital*,' I have done this with my understanding of Marxism and not that I wrote it after knowing the history of Philosophy.

The meaning of the term 'Idealism', which makes its appearance again and again in the essays on Philosophy, was not comprehensible any better after reading these works than before. In fact, the huge importance Marx gave to Hegel, the Idealist who did not base on proper logic, has become a big puzzle to me for a long time. I am aware of the explanation Marx offered for his high opinion of Hegel. However, should a proponent of 'the absolute idea' be held in such high esteem – this question would not leave me. That Marx described himself as the disciple of Hegel gave me jitters, in the beginning, seeing the prospect that the teacher of Marx must be adorned ahead of Marx himself. Hegel could be Marx's teacher. Nevertheless, Hegel too would have a teacher. And, that teacher too would have a teacher. Thus, every teacher would have a teacher. I am not concerned about these teachers. My teacher is enough for me! My teacher is Marx! My teacher would teach all that he learned to his disciples. That would suffice. This teacher, however, placed us in a grave predica-ment by decreeing that the Philosophy of Hegel must be studied. To honor the words of the teacher, we will have to study indeed the books (not books, only essays) of Philosophy and not just flip the pages!

Can one grasp these Philosophies by reading? If there is one discipline that cannot be understood in the least even after studying day and night, that discipline is Philosophy. When the books are opened the first thing one gets immediately is that, 'it would be a waste of time

to read the books not meant for us.' Then, what will happen to the dictum of the teacher? Out of affection for the teacher, placing a dozen of books all around, if you study the books for ten days, one or two sentences may take pity on you. Only the sentences, not paragraphs that take pity on you. After finishing the study, what we know is very little, what we get is little and what we lose is more.

We will realize to a small extent that these sentences attempted to convey to us how from the previous times the human beings have been comprehending the Nature and the society, how much puzzlement these people may have undergone in these attempts, and what distance we have traveled in understanding these concepts. On seeing one or two such sentences, one would be surprised at once: 'this knowledge seems to be quite useful'. But again a second thought would appear to displace the first impression thus, 'Not quite, perhaps somewhat useful'. Nevertheless, amidst the studies of the philosophical writings, one has to convince himself thus, 'perhaps we should temper the impatience'. However, if anyone fails (why 'anyone' else, if I fail myself) to develop interest in the philosophical writings, it would not be fair in the least to consider this response as 'impatience.' If a new knowledge is comprehensible to the seekers, will not the new knowledge enhance their enthusiasm, and not 'distress'? The distress will creep in only when there is not even an iota of benefit, won't it? Regardless of the study with an abundant quantum of patience, we will not be scholars of Philosophy. We shall remain the first class pupils before these monumental works. At least, I will not be in a position to pass the first class ever.

Is the discipline of Philosophy endowed with quality to transform the readers into scholars – this is my doubt. Leave alone scholars, is this discipline endowed with quality to keep readers as readers – this is my second doubt. My doubts are my own, aren't they?

★

3. What is 'Philosophy'? What is the difference between the Natural Sciences and Philosophy?

I have looked at many essays and books for answers to these questions. Not simply looked at them, but read them. I did not find clear answers anywhere. I don't believe that not only I but any of the ordinary readers such as me can find the answers. However, if you toil over a few weeks keeping a couple of dictionaries by your side along with the Philosophy book, a little bit begins to become familiar. You cannot be delighted, though. Nevertheless, you must be content.

In Telugu, '*tatva saastram*' is the equivalent to the English term 'Philosophy' ('*tatvam*'= essential Nature of anything; '*saastram*'= science). Because of the term '*saastram*' (science), the readers think that Philosophy is also a discipline same as the natural sciences. There is no such confusion for the English readers. In English, there are different names for different disciplines. In English, the natural science is 'science'. The discipline of Philosophy is 'Philosophy'. Because of the difference in the terms, the English readers can see them as different entities. That means '*tatva saastram*' (Philosophy) is not a 'science' though it has the word '*saastram*' (science) in its name. What would the discipline of Philosophy teach when it is not a discipline of science? Will the teachings of Philosophy be as authentic as those of science?

We know what natural sciences are. Botany, Zoology, Anthropology, Geology, Astronomy, Chemistry, Medicine – such as these make the natural sciences. Likewise, we also know what 'social science' is.

The relations of production (the relations of labour) should only be considered as the appropriate social science. Those people who do not accept this social science will have a different 'social science.' When seen from this perspective, Philosophy is neither a natural science nor a social science. Nevertheless, this discipline too talks about the aspects of Nature and society. 'To speak about the truth and principles related to the whole universe is the job of Philosophy', claim the Philosophers.

Those who talk about Philosophy (the essential Nature of things) are Philoso-phers. If anyone says, 'the human beings should talk the truth,' then, it is one Philosophy. 'Why the human beings do not always talk the truth and tell lies?' – Philosophy does not think about this question. It cannot explain things which it does not know. Its function is to preach some morality, a morality justified by its values. It would be contended saying, 'Speak the truth. Abstain from speaking untruth!' Nevertheless, if what it speaks is a good maxim, it will help the human beings to improvise their conduct. A maxim that preaches not to tell lies will only benefit, not harm, the human being, won't it?

'Speak truth, abstain from speaking untruth,' will any natural science state such a maxim? Would Zoology, Botany, Astronomy or any other natural science state such a maxim? Certainly not. It is not the function of the natural sciences. Or else, will a social science state such a maxim? In fact, this is an element that must be an integral part of the social sciences. A correct social science will not remain quiet after saying, 'speak the truth.' It will also explain why the human beings speak lies, what conditions prompt these acts, and how these conditions can be abolished. The function of the social science is not simply to criticise the flaws of the human beings, but it should also be capable of explaining the causes and the solutions.

The Gandhi's maxim, 'See no evil, hear no evil, talk no evil' has become a great Philosophy! There exists abundant quantum of evil in the society circulating freely. A person who preaches not to see, hear and talk the evil, instead of asking the people to stop the evil, becomes a Philosopher! The Philosopher does not think why evil exists. Not even concerned in the least regarding 'the evil'.

'The human beings should be connected by the bonds of equality' – this saying is a maxim. A social science that advocates such philosophies would be able to explain why such bonds of equality do not exist and how such bonds must be formed.

All those who discuss aspects of the natural sciences and the social sciences are scientists. The Philosophers, however, are not scientists of this kind. Therefore, they are Philosophers. They are aware of a few aspects of science. Philosophy may have some overlap with science. However, Philosophy cannot be science. Philosophy is a way of thinking.

Previously, there existed a period of time when there was no science. The early human beings looked at the sky and surmised in amazement thus, 'What are the sun, the moon, and the stars? How did we, the human beings, come to be? What will happen when we die? Where will we go?' This implies that the philosophical thinking had begun then. Even though such thinking did not bear labels such as 'Philosophy' or 'science' at that point of time, thoughts about the Nature and the human life constituted a sort of science. Those who initiated thoughts would gradually discover certain good things. Since the time of the primitive societies, the thinking and the wisdom of the people of a phase are commensurate with the Nature of the relations prevalent in that specific phase. If the natural sciences made a beginning in a specific phase, the people of that phase might be acquainted with a few elements of the science. Either in the past or in the present, a person who

uses the scientific knowledge in carrying out a specific task remains an intellectual of science in relation to the task, but in the other aspects of his life, he holds old ideas and old traditions unrelated to science. The science teacher teaches science in his class. As soon as he enters his home, he would press his arms before the frame of a baba or a deity hanging on the wall. Likewise, even good scientists, on the day of their faith take a dip in the sea. 'Science is science, and the sentiment is a sentiment,' they would say. A scientist may not be a scientist in his personal life. Likewise, a Philosopher too may not be bound by his Philosophy.

Those who write stories are writers, those who sing songs are singers, and those who draw pictures are painters — if this is so, those who philosophize are Philosophers. What they understand and say depends on the society they live in, their experiences, and their imaginations. There could be flaws, facts and all the other things in what they say. One Philosopher finds flaws in another Philosopher. And, a third Philosopher finds flaws in the second Philosopher. A variety of debates and squabbles keep going.

In the primitive times, when there was no science, there may have existed people who were bewildered seeing the sun in the sky. The bewilderment may have taken the form of Philosophy. However, today we are aware of dozens of the natural sciences. We keep learning about many more issues through the sciences. The drudgery of traveling long distances between the cities and countries has been lessened. The travel time has reduced. We can predict many natural calamities before they happen. Many sciences assist us in the health matters. Not only regarding the associations between the planets, the sciences can provide information on the distances between the earth and any star in the universe. Many new comforts are becoming a reality. When so

many things are facilitated by science, what is the role of Philosophy still? Why are the philosophies needed yet? The articles on Philosophy indicate that many more people like me have such doubts. The reason why the readers are not free from such doubts is because there are no writings that properly explained what Philosophy is all about! We can appreciate a thing, whether or not it is needed or how much it is needed, only if we first understand what this thing is, don't we?

A few people regard Philosophy as 'the science of sciences'. That means that 'Philosophy can educate other sciences.' Can a discipline which is not science itself teach other disciples that are sciences? They say that it would teach. They also say that Philosophy explains the principles by which the natural sciences progress and should progress. But, do the natural sciences not tell us how our knowledge of Nature ought to be? Does the social science not tell us how our social knowledge should be? For this, do we need Philosophy? How can Philosophy teach the other sciences? We, thus, face new questions. However, we have answers to these questions. Botany describes aspects related only to the plants, will it preach that 'one should not speak lies'? Zoology talks about matters related only to the animals, will it preach that 'equality is supreme'? Likewise, any science would discuss aspects related only to itself, but does not lay down principles common to all the sciences, does it? Philosophy precisely performs this function. Or, the discipline that performs this function is Philosophy. Consider the axiom, 'Any given matter constantly changes and does not remain static. Only Philosophy, but no other discipline, proposes an axiom such as this. An axiom such as this applies to all the disciplines. All the scientists should take a note of this axiom. How could the Philo-sopher state this principle? Did he examine all

forms of the matter, to find how each of them transforms? There could be some scientific basis for some of the tenets which the Philosophers proposed. Their own perception and imagination could be the basis for certain other issues. It is for this reason, many of these philosophies turned wrong. Even the philosophies that are right may remain halfbaked.

An unwise saying of a stupid *Pullayya* uttered a thousand years ago is still held as a wise axiom by many of the philosophical writings even today.

That amusing axiom: 'We cannot bathe twice in the same river. The water keeps flowing,' said a man called *Pullayya*. "Oh, how cleverly he said!' people kept on admiring him since then. The 'same river' means, the 'same water'. This is to say that we cannot bathe in the same water twice since the water moves forward and that the water that touched the body once cannot touch the body again! In water that is flowing forward, can anyone bathe once, if not twice? If one stands for half an hour in the flowing water, is not the water touching the body new every moment? To the person who stated that 'we cannot take bath twice', it did not occur that 'we cannot take bath even once.' That is not all. If this *Pullayya* took a bath at home near the water tub, would he pour the same water again and again on his body? A mugful of water will fall off his body as soon as it is poured. Can the bath be completed with the first mugful of water? He will have to take the new mug of water. If twenty mugs full of water were used, every mug contains new water. Therefore, even at home, can one take a bath twice with the same water? Those people who wash in a bathtub also have to change the water. Even if one stands in a lake or a pond to take a bath, the water surrounding the body will not be the same. The water that touched the body once will scatter away. 'We cannot bathe twice in the same river with the same water.' What is new in

this statement? Where ever one takes a bath, it is the same case with the water, isn't it? That *Pullayya* was a Greek intellectual called Heraclitus. In those times, he also said a few good things. Another man called *Ellayya* (= Dick) enters the fray with *Pullayya*. What *Ellayya* says is this: 'Leave alone the bath in the river. We cannot even wash our feet twice in the flowing water,' He says so as if it is a greater saying. And, as if we can wash the feet once in the flowing water though cannot wash twice! This *Ellayya* will be considered wiser than *Pullayya*. In Philosophy, we will find many such naïve axioms as this. Nevertheless, all of them indicate that human beings are engaged in process of thinking.

(Do not be mistaken that this is to belittle the rural folks like *Pullayya*s and *Ellayya*s! Even great intellectuals, in some contexts, are foolish as if they are devoid of the common sense. Many people do not use their own heads. In such cases, anyone has to be the *Pullayya*s, *Ellayya*s, *Pullamma*s, and *Ellamma*s. This applies to all.)

If a little of good and benefit are not accrued of the tenets, then, how can these tenets constitute a Philosophy? It would not have formed so, isn't it? But, we cannot say so. Have not the religious scriptures remained in existence since thousands of years? Have not astronomy and palmistry survived? Who has benefited from the religious scriptures? The people such as those who murdered Bruno! The longevity is not an indication of the supremacy of a surviving element. (Alas, this too appears to be transforming into a 'tenet'.)

All that we have seen so far is only an introduction to Philosophy. The real story remains ahead.

Do not ask me, 'what philosophical writings you have read to comment on Philosophy?' I have read that much sufficient enough to say this much. Without reading that much, can anyone convey this much? If what is being conveyed is wrong, there will be intellectuals who will correct it, won't they?

★

4. Creationism and Idealism

'The sun, the moon, and the constellations of stars in the sky, and the flora and fauna, how did all of them come about? Who made them all? How did the human beings come about? Can the human beings understand the universe?' – The philosophical writings tell us that these are the questions that constitute the primary queries in Philosophy. This is a discipline that originated from the inquisitive-ness to understand Nature and the society.

A variety of doctrines emerged in search of answers to these questions. If all the doctrines propose the same idea, then, there won't be so many doctrines. There will be only one doctrine. But, since the people seeking answers to the questions would exhibit their respective scholarship, many a doctrine emerged. Before attempting to under-stand these doctrines, we must first enumerate the terms and concepts around which the doctrines revolve. Nature, universe, society, matter, thing, human being, brains, spirit, soul, thought, consciousness, image – terms and concepts such as these keep coming and going in these doctrines. Of these concepts, first, we must discuss a little about 'the matter' and 'the thing.'

Everything existing in Nature is a natural substance (matter). It is the matter not made by the human beings. A tree in the forest is a natural matter. The wind blowing is a natural matter. The water in the river is natural matter. All of the earth, the entirety of Nature, is a natural thing. The matter has another name called 'Substance'.

In Philosophy, while speaking about natural substances, they use the word 'things'. According to the Marxian economics, 'things' are those which the human beings make. Whatever is found in Nature, and not related to human labor in any manner is not a 'thing'. It is a

substance, the natural matter. If trees grew due to the agricultural labors of the human beings, they too become things, however, living things. All the animals nurtured by the human beings are living things. In philosophical discourses, however, there is no distinction between the matter and a thing. When someone asks 'how all these things have come about?' this actually means asking, 'how all these substances (matter) have come about?' We must draw only such an inference. There is no error in doing so.

Now, we will briefly examine the two doctrines that we mentioned in the title of this chapter.

Creationism:

This is the doctrine of a few who enthusiastically seek an answer to the question, 'How did this universe come about?'

'How will a thing come about? It will come about only if someone makes it, won't it? Without anyone making, even a small pot won't come into being on its own, will it? The small pot will come into being, only if there is a maker who makes it. Same holds true even for the universe. If the universe came into being, the creator who created the universe must be existing. The maker must be existing before the existence of the universe. He existed before and created the universe later. He created the universe and governing it. That creator is God! There is a 'spirit' in the body of the human being. The spirit does not perish even if the body perishes. The spirit of the great devotee will merge in God. The spirit of the person who is not a devotee will take birth again and again. There are heaven and hell in the universe.' – This is what creationism is. There are other names to creationism such as 'the spiritualism' and the like. Since the primitive times, this is the first doctrine that emerged to explain the universe.

In fact, there is a smart logic in this argument. 'Any item, even a small earthen pot will not come into being unless someone made it. How can such a gigantic

universe come into being without anyone making it?' – this line of thinking is wise and logical for those times.

However, if there is no scope to raise question against a doctrine, it will be a correct doctrine. If there are flaws of any kind in that doctrine, the questions will start appearing gradually. Thus, smarter questions soon followed the smart theory of creationism. True, even a small earthen pot cannot be made unless there is a potter. We cannot refute this fact. Likewise, we may even agree that the universe indeed came into being due to the creator. In that case, won't the pot maker theory also apply to the creator of the universe? Should we not raise a question about the creator just as we raised the question, 'How did the pot come about?' How did the creator of the universe come about? For the creator to be, should there not be a creator of the creator? There should be a creator, shouldn't he? Should we assume, then, that there existed a bigger creator before the smaller creator and that bigger creator created the smaller creator? Alright, let us assume so. But, won't there be a question regarding the bigger creator of the universe too? There would be. Then, how did the bigger creator come about? There must be another creator creating the bigger creator, mustn't he be? What was the beginning prior to any creator?' – these are the questions on the creationism.

Then, the answer by the creationism: 'God need not be created. He is self-creating. He is self-emanating. He creates himself' ('*swayambhu*').

The counter criticism: If creating self and self-emerging is possible, this situation applies to the universe as well. The universe can create itself. The universe is innately natural. A maker is needed to make a thing such as the pot. But there is no need of a maker for the formation of natural substances, unlike in the case of pot. Nature is not something that needs to be created by someone. Nature is

natural, not 'a creation'. Everything existing in Nature is amenable to proof. God is not accessible to any proof. The pot maker is visible to all. The creator of the universe is not visible in any manner, cannot be proved in any manner. Therefore, Nature is natural and real! God is unnatural and unreal!" Thus, there is a serious criticism on creationism. Nevertheless, regardless of the ardent critique, the doctrine of creationism is fully alive today. On the other hand, the critiques of the doctrine are also alive. These two components are moving along side by side. This is the first step in Philosophy.

Idealism:

Idealism emerged while the creationism remained in existence. In the terminology of these Philosophers, the term creator has gone into hiding and the term 'universal spirit' has appeared in its place. 'The universal spirit' also has other names such as 'absolute idea' ('*parama bhaavam*'), 'Indivisible idea' ('*akhanda bhaavam*'), and the like.

What the doctrine proposes is this: 'The universal spirit existed prior to the universe. That spirit created this universe. The universal spirit is the basis of the universe,' – Is it clear?

We could raise many questions on this doctrine as well, such as 'What is a universal spirit? Where does it exist?' We may raise any number of questions but what sort of answers do we get? They say, 'The universal spirit means, the spirit of the universe. It exists anywhere, all over the universe, from the very beginning.' Did the proponents of the universal spirit talk of this idea with a clear understanding? Only for the sake of reputation, they set aside the God and bring in the universal spirit as the creator of the universe. This does not mean that the Philosophers have given up the belief in God. Sensing the criticism against God a little, they altered the name of God; that is all. They did this to make the people believe in God more zealously and to invent some new theory. Nevertheless, the new

theory has become a great philosophical doctrine! *If the listeners with blocked brains and gaped mouths* are prepared to listen anything the tellers will preach meaningless doctrines. As they are not scientists, the Philosophers do not have an obligation to prove what they say. They can talk whatever comes to their mind, and they do.

The other name of 'idea' is 'the spirit'. That is, a universal spirit or a universal idea. According to Idealism, it is the idea that created the universe (Nature)! Since the matter originated out of the idea. the idea is primary, and the matter is secondary.

Idealism, however, is not uniform. Depending on the assumptions of the proponents, Idealist doctrines differ considerably from one another. Except the proponents, others cannot understand the names of those doctrines. There are many names such as 'subjective Idealism', 'objective Idealism' and so on and so forth. Did the proponents use these terms with a clear understanding or is it gibberish? Did they know that the universal spirit existed prior to the universe, and outside and inside of the universe? Before pronouncing, did they perform some experimentation?

For example, see a few tenets of Idealism! Not just reading, try to see if you can understand these sentences while reading!

'The universal spirit is the foundation of all the phenomena'

'In the universe, the primary aspect transforms into the life-stimulating element.'

'The aggregation of senses constitutes the things. Without the subjects ('*vishayi*'), there won't be things.'

'Nothing exists outside of the soul. All exist within the soul. Their existence depends on the understanding of the soul.'

Have you understood easily? Not these four sentences alone, even after completing a grand book of a thousand pages, one cannot understand Idealism. Even those who write articles criticizing Idealism, do not and

cannot explain to the readers what the Idealism says in such a manner so that readers understand it. While reading these articles, at times, I pondered, 'Would anyone talk such crazy things? - That the universal spirit existed before the universe and it created the universe? Poor folks, perhaps, there is a different meaning hidden in what they say! Perhaps, we are not able to understand that meaning!' This is how I used to think.

'Can human beings be so ignorant?— this doubt did not leave me in the beginning.

However, after seeing the scholars of the present times, I could clear my doubt completely. The present day intellectuals possessing university degrees say. 'We are not superstitious. But, there is 'a supernatural power' in the universe. Without that supernatural power how could the universe be? We believe in the supernatural power.' If the intellectuals possessing degrees of today are so entangled in 'the supernatural power', what is so strange if the innocent people of the olden times believed in 'the universal spirit'? The believers of the magical powers will trust that the magical power can perform any miracle, don't they?

In the beginning, we considered a few reasons for not understanding a book. The first of the reasons fully applies to the doctrine of Idealism. Speaking about the universal spirit is the same as speaking about God, who does not exist in Nature. Something nonexistent cannot be factual regardless of the grandeur of depiction. Therefore, just as God is unintelligible, the universal spirit is also unintelligible. Since both 'God' and 'universal spirit' mean the same thing, we could consider these two concepts as one and the same doctrine namely, Idealism. The heaven and hell, the soul, and the rebirth — all these find place in Idealism. Next, we have to examine 'Materialism'.

★

5. Materialism

Materialism considers Nature as primary and the human thought as secondary aspects of the universe. It does not accept the concepts of the creator and the universal spirit as factual elements. According to this doctrine, in the entire universe, matter is primary and the human consciousness is secondary. Materialism counters and criticizes the shortcomings of Idealism that do not stand to the reasoning. Criticism of Idealism is not the only feature of Materialism. Materialism has its own qualities. The task of Materialism is to provide knowledge related to Nature.

Materialism is a doctrine that considers that 'Nature, matter, and the society exist outside of the human thought'. The idea of 'the tree' cannot originate without a tree existing outside. The human consciousness depends on the external conditions. The matter is the point of origin of the consciousness. The consciousness of the human beings depends on the conditions and the materials to which they are bound. The consciousness that originated on the basis of those conditions can transform the conditions, if necessary.

The Materialism, however, did not have a completely correct, clear, and logical perception since the very beginning of its existence. In criticizing Idealism, Materialism did not demonstrate a proper wisdom in the beginning. The uniqueness of Materialism, in the beginning, was restricted to realizing the fact that the matter is the primary aspect of the universe. In spite of realizing 'the significance of the matter', Materialism failed to free itself from the concepts of 'creator' and 'some power'. During the phases of ignorance regarding the course of Nature, Materialism too was not free from shortcomings. Just as there are varieties in Idealism, Materialism too has varieties. Metaphysics, Crude Materialism, Formalism, Skepticism, Agno-sticism, this -ism, that -ism and some other Materialism and the like. The teachings of each Philosopher became a doctrine.

Logical reasoning is the real strength that Materialism ought to possess. When formulated without a defect, logical reasoning becomes 'dialectics'. Dialectics is a reasoning that must depend on the real matter in existence and, the condition of that matter. The under-standing of any issue or any matter based on its condition is to grasp the truth. Learning from the knowledge of dialectics, the faulty Crude Materialism trans-forms itself into 'creative Materialism'. It is called 'Dialectical Materialism'.

To understand anything in the universe, one must depend on the condition of the matter. What is the sun? What is the moon? The sun is a burning sphere. The moon is a planet of soil. Since the conditions of these matters are such, to understand them as such becomes the correct Materialism. The belief that the sun is a god, the moon is another god, and the gods can perform miracles cannot be considered as the doctrine of Materialism.

The diverse ways of thinking have originated from the quest to understand the universe. Regardless of how many different types are these doctrines, essentially they all fall under only two categories, the correct and incorrect thinking.

Once the correct doctrine emerges, all the incorrect doctrines must fall silent, mustn't they? However, it hasn't been happening this way. The erroneous doctrines are still prospering with a stronger might. Even to this day, the people are divided into two ways of thinking believing or not believing in God. The believers seek the elucidation of the worlds of the gods, not the societies of the human beings.

Out of a hundred people, 90 believe in Creationism and nine in Idealism. And, the remaining single person, one in a hundred, may be a Materialist. Else, one in a thousand! Or, perhaps one in a hundred thousand! Why does ignorance not relish knowledge? One cannot find an answer to this question in the natural sciences. For the answer, one must look in a correct social science. Or in a Philosophy that is aware of such a social science. The condition of the human beings has preserved ignorance intact since the primitive times to the contemporary times. Owing to this, knowledge stands aloof unable to defeat ignorance. ★

6. The human beings after the earth, Or The earth after the human beings?

Since there are some short comings in the Materialism of the past, we need to examine at least a dozen issues in order to learn about Materialism devoid of shortcomings. Some of these issues are indeed necessary and must be learnt. The remaining issues are the subject matter of time-pass arguments of the *Pullayyas*, *Ellayyas*, *Rangammas*, and *Mangammas*. However, the authors who write on Philosophy consider all the discourses as great.

A long time ago, a question arose: Did the universe come into existence first or the human thought (consciousness)? Over the thousands of years, there have been arguments and counter-arguments on this issue as if it is a big doubt. The continuation of the question whether matter is first or the human consciousness is similar to the question whether the earth was first or the human beings wandering on the earth were first! For the human thought to exist, the human beings must exist first. For the human beings to exist, there should be earth under their feet first. If the earth did not form first, where will the human beings form? Yet, the intellectuals have a big doubt whether or not the earth was the first! We may assume that the wisdom of the people of the primitive times was so low when the knowledge had not yet begun. But, over the thousands of years, even to this day, there has been doubt whether the matter was first or the consciousness was the first! There have been the doctrines of Idealism, Materialism, above all the dialectics to clarify the doubts!

After birth, since infant stage, the human beings watch the trees, the birds and the sky. As these things exist in reality, humans consider them as the real objects. The objects reflect in the brains of the viewers. The thoughts will begin in the brains of the viewers, regarding the external objects that form the basis of the images. Like the rest of the body, the human brain is also a substance (matter). Any sap that is secreted by the glands in the body is substance. However, the thoughts originating from the brain are not 'sap'. The thoughts are not substances.

The mango tree existing outside is matter. The eyes are the means that transmit the image of the matter to the brain. The brain is one kind of mirror. The image of the matter, an object or a human being, whatever stands in front of the mirror, makes a reflection on the mirror. If the object moves away, the image in the mirror also moves away. (The mirror will never be in a situation that no image reflects in it. Even if the mirror is placed on the floor facing down, the image of the floor will be in the mirror. To reflect an image is the job of the mirror. The mirror cannot think on its own.

The brain, in contrast, is not just a mirror that reflects an image. The brain is the basis of the thought. An idea is the consequence of the thought in the brain. practice follows the idea. The ideas can preserve the external matter (the condition of the matter) or alter the matter.

A comparison between the mirror and the brain is possible only to some extent. The reflection of the visible tree on the brain is comparable to the reflection of an object standing before the mirror, and that is where the comparison ends. Even if the tree which a person saw disappears, the image of the tree fell on the brain will not disappear. Unlike the mirror, the brain is not an inanimate object.

The mirror does not think but the brain thinks. (The brain of the larger animals too thinks to some extent.) The human brain can imagine unseen objects based on what has been seen already. The brain of a person can visualize a jackfruit tree depending on the lucid description of others even though that person has not seen a jackfruit tree previously. The image of an unseen object could not be formed in the brain if the person has not heard about that unseen object.

There is a strange doubt in 'Idealism'. Consider the example of 'the tree', which a person sees. Here the Idealists have the following doubts: Does the tree exist outside or the person imagines of a thing that does not exist outside? Otherwise, does a human being imagine of an unknown object first and perceive the external object in accordance with the imagination? – These are the doubts of the Idealists! Not even doubts. The outlook of the Idealists, is like that.

This is how I understood Idealism. If there is anything wrong in my understanding, the fault is not mine. The reason for the unintelligibility is not simply the language. The actual reason is that whatever they explain is utterly incompre-hensible.

I said previously that four reasons make the writings unintelligible. Look at the second reason – 'to try to explain unfamiliar matters'. This reason applies to me. I could not understand at all what Idealism is. Yet, without knowing and without having the confidence of knowing, I attempt to explain this Philosophy. I am saying what I have read.

Even if someone could explain Idealism in a way making a complete justification to the doctrine, there is still no rationale in the doctrine. However much one may elaborately explain what rationality can be there in the concept of universal spirit. How

can the human brain conceive a matter that does not exist in Nature? Instead of taking the strain of countering their absurd ranting, it would serve best to call the people 'insane' who eat all the fruits of the tree and still quibble 'Does the tree really exist'?

The reason why Idealists debate 'whether or not the tree exists' is because it is in their Nature. It is a malady to believe something existing 'as non-existing' and something non-existing 'as existing'! The Idealists imagine of a non-existing god and the non-existing creator of the universe as existing. And they deny the earth and the mango tree that really exists. Out of this insanity, they raise doubts on every real issue wondering 'whether or not' the issue is real.

Over the generations, even to this day, there have been debates as if these matters make a wise riddle! A single reply a Materialist must give to an Idealist is 'You an insane fellow! Stop talking nonsense!' However, since the Idealist is, in reality, a mad one, he would pounce on the Materialist and say without much consideration for his theory, 'You are insane! Your father is insane! And your grandfather is insane!' Therefore, it is not possible to defeat that insane fellow with such abuses. In order to defeat his argument, we must explain the Nature of his insanity to the readers.

Indeed, our Materialists have been performing this task, but with great delicacy! 'My dear, have not the human beings been born after the earth? Hasn't the earth existed before the human being? If the human beings existed before the earth, please tell me where they would sit and stand.' In this fashion, like a mother narrating a story before putting the baby to sleep, they try to fill the insane heads of the believers of Universal Spirit with their niceties and dialectics. They even believe that this strategy would work. This is all

what the atheists do.

If we want to tell the innocent readers who believe in and intoxicated with universal spirit, one must articulate in a language that is intelligible to them. The writers of Materialism are unable to understand such a small point. In fact, if the writings of the writers of Materialism are proper, the translation of these works will also be proper. It is true. If the original writings are full of pompous terminology, the translators must make them simple.

A book is for the reader, not for the writer! Unless the writers and the translators turn their attention towards the readers, however good a Philosophy may be, it will not reach the readers.

The readers will have to run after the creator and the universal spirit for clarity. Look at the pompous Sanskritized terms crowded in every sentence and paragraphs in essays of Philosophy in Telugu.

[Translator's note: Here, for about two pages, the original writer cited numerous terms and expressions used in Philosophy writings in Telugu which are highly Sanskritized and extremely difficult to understand . She made the following comments with reference to such terms**]**

We find several such difficult and unintelligible terms in a single article on Philosophy. If we count they will exceed 90% of the total terms.

Should we read Philosophy, Materialism etc. written in such language! To describe this as scholarly language (*pandita bhasha*) is utterly wrong. Will these terms be intelligible to even scholars (*pandit*s)? Poor guys, they read few text books and appear for couple of examinations and get a degree in '*pandit*' training. Have they ever come across such tough language? Will the reasons ever come out as to why people are unable to understand and hence do not open the books?

★

7. Won't the questions on 'the creator'and 'the universal spirit' also arise on 'the natural matter'?

Since the creator and the Universal Spirit are the same, we will use a single word 'the creator' to represent both the words.

'How did the creator come into existence? Who created the creator? What existed before the creator?' We asked these questions previously regarding the creator, didn't we? Likewise, won't the same questions target the natural substance (matter) too? 'How did the matter originate? Who made the matter? What existed before the matter?'

Why not? There should be questions posed regarding the natural substance, and there will be questions unless we question everything and find correct answers, how will we learn about the universe? We must invariably clear every doubt.

There exists a mango tree in the forest. The tree is natural matter. Initially no human beings planted the tree there. No one did anything to nurture the tree. The tree grew on its own accord in Nature. We can imagine very easily how the tree may have come about. Initially, a mango seed must have fallen in this place. The seed must have sunk into the soil due to rain water. The fertility of the soil, sunshine, water and wind, when all these elements combined, a sprout germinated out of the seed and grew into a tree in a few years. We could conceive the aspects of the wild tree in this manner.

A tree is a matter. All the elements necessary for its emergence are also different substances (matters). The seed is one substance. The soil is another substance. The sunshine is yet another substance. The water, the wind

and all of them are substances. A new matter in the form of a tree emerged as all these matters were combined into one.

All the matters necessary for the formation of the tree existed before the tree. That is, if those elements, namely, the seed, soil, and the sunshine did not exist before hand, could the tree have formed? It wouldn't have. That means a tree is a matter that formed from the combination of certain other matters and not an entity that came into existence indepen-dently and spontaneously, out of nothingness and without any relation to other matters. We can perceive any other tree in this manner. How did 'the matter' called a tree emerge? 'The new matter formed from the other matters that already existed.' This is the only answer to the question.

Leave alone the tree. We know how the trees emerge. Then, how did 'the other matters' necessary for the formation of the mango tree come about? The earth and the sunshine existed before the tree. How did they come into existence? Thus, the questions that arose regarding the tree will also arise against 'the other matters', and such questions should arise.

There are, however, no other answers to these questions. The answer that applies to the tree will also apply to any substance. The other matters would emerge, and would have emerged, the same way as the tree did. The tree did not emerge without a relation to the other matters, by itself, out of a vacuum, did it? Likewise, none of the other matters would emerge from the nothingness. Any matter would materialize from the union of the other matters that are needed for its formation. In the absence of the prior matters, the subsequent matter cannot come into existence. The earth, the sun or the stars, all of them would form out of the matters that are needed for their formation. This is the principle for the formation of any matter. For every matter, the principle of formation is the same as that of the tree.

Since no matter can emerge from the nothingness, all the matters must come from the other matters and through certain evolutionary processes of formation. If we consider the earth, it has its own reasons for

its formation. If we consider the sun, it has its own reasons for its formation. Any matter existing in Nature would have formed from other matters, through specific phases and processes unique for the formation of that specific matter. We must realize that this is what happens with all the matters, from a pebble to the constellations.

We can understand, with all the clarity, how the living beings such as the birds, animals, and the humans emerge. How does a human baby emerge? Will the baby form on its own without any elements causing it and from out of the nothingness? The baby would form from a woman and man existing before the baby and due to certain substances, won't it? After the birth, the baby will grow and live only if the air and food are available. If the matters needed for the birth and growth of the baby did not exist, the baby would not have formed and grown. That means a living being emerges out of other living beings!

From all the things discussed so far, one thing is evident. It is clear that for the formation of new substance, the availability of the other substances is essential. We could consider this aspect as a rational inference. From this conjecture, however, have we found an answer to the question, 'how did the matter come about?'

When we speak of 'matter', if we put the question, 'how matter is formed', it will be a wrong question. The question ought not to be like that. One has to specify the matter, about which we want to know. If we raise the question, 'how did the mango tree emerge?' we will get an answer. If we put the question, 'how did the earth form?' we will find an answer. If we ask, "How did Sun form?" it will have an answer. 'How wind emerged? How water formed? –If we look at things in this manner, there would be a cause for any and every specific matter in Nature, even if we are not aware of the cause. However, if someone asks 'how matter came into existence', counter question will be 'which matter?'

Let us suppose that the conversation between two people took place as follows:

"Can you tell how the matter formed?"

"Which matter are you asking about? About the guava tree? Water? Air? The moon? How can I tell you without knowing what you want??"

"Not about this matter or that. 'The matter' exists in all the things, doesn't it? I would like to know how that matter originates."

"It is not the same kind of matter that exists in all. Specify the kind you want."

"Alright, how did 'the tree' come about?"

"Which tree?"

"Well, should I specify?"

"Indeed, you must. 'The tree' will be a specific tree; can there be a tree without a specification? Will there be the same principles characterizing all the trees? Some trees emerge from the seeds while the others come when the branches fall to the soil. And, there could be many other ways of propagation that we do not know yet!"

"Is that so? I didn't know. Say something!"

"Which tree you want to know about?"

"Alright, tell me about the jackfruit tree."

"That tree comes out of a jackfruit seed."

"Where does that 'seed' come from?"

"Won't the past jackfruit tree bear fruits? Won't the fruits bear the seeds? The seeds are the germs. The new tree will emerge from those seeds. Does not the new matter come from the old matter?"

"Not like that. I would like to know where 'the original matter' came from."

"There is nothing like 'the original matter' anywhere. All the matters will have their own specific qualities. Soil, coal, sesame seeds, or the ocean. Ask me about one of them. When 'the original matter' does not exist, how can something non-existing come about? That matter does not exist, hence, cannot come."

"Well, I do not know then how to ask?"

"I can see that. You may ask differently, 'it is said that the matter is made up of the atoms. How the atoms have come about?' Can't you ask me like this?"

"Then you would say, 'which atoms?' and that 'All the atoms

are not the same kind'. Never mind let me ask now. How did 'the oxygen atoms' form? How did they emerge in the beginning?"

"If I answered that they are made out of certain elements, then, won't you ask me again, how did those elements have come about?"

"Why not? I would for sure. Otherwise, how to know how the primordial matter emerged?"

"Alright, I might answer that the primordial matter emerged in such and such a way. Then, will there be an answer to the question, 'how did the such and such material come from?"

"Look here; do you know what you are saying? First of all, do you know anything regarding 'the matter'?"

"Have I not been giving answers to each and every question of yours?"

"What answers? I ask something, and you answer something else. What did you answer when I asked 'how did the matter emerge?' If you don't know, then, say so! I will ask someone else."

"The 'someone' else will also answer like me. How many people will you run around? Look, let us think in a different way. A few previously existing substances are needed for the germination of the mango tree, isn't it? A few other substances also are needed for the tree to grow and sustain itself. And some other past substances are needed for the formation of these past matters. If we keep walking into the past in this manner, will we ever find a material that we can call as 'the primordial matter'? Alright, let us assume that we will find a material like that. Then, won't there be a question regarding, 'how that matter came about?' There must be yet an older matter behind the primordial matter. However far we go backwards, should a substance appear behind a given substance or should nothingness appear? Or should we presume that only nothingness existed in the beginning, the diverse matters formed out of the nothingness, and since then, from the amalgamation of the old matters the new matters have been forming? Indeed, our problem will be solved if we assume so. But, if we consider that the matters emerged from the nothingness, then, won't a

new question stare at us, 'how can matter begin from the space that contains nothing? Should we not find an answer to that question? What did we say about the creator of the universe? We should say that behind the formation of a creator, there will have to be a bigger creator. Thus, regardless of how farther we walk backwards examining the bigger creators, we will never find an answer to the question, 'how did the bigger creator come about?' Likewise, regardless of how farther we walk backwards, we will not see 'the coming of the matter from the nothingness'. That means we will find neither the beginning of the creator nor the beginning of the matter."

"In that case, let us consider that the creator and the matter both are the same things."

"Indeed, we could, if they are the same thing! Are they? The creator does not appear, whereas the matter appears. The creator cannot be proved in any manner. The matter can be proved by all different means. The matter is real whereas the creator is unreal. The matter is true whereas the creator is untrue. How can they both be the same?"

"Sure, since the creator is not a real thing, we can understand if the origin of the creator cannot be traced. But, the matter is a real thing, isn't it? Why can't we find the origin of the real matter?"

"Well, we will have to think. We must depend on the logic within our reach."

"Do we have to think now all by ourselves? The Philosophers or the scientists, have they not thought about it? Did they not say something?"

"Indeed, they have, My Dear. They said, 'There is not a beginning or an end to the matter. This is a physical world. Must we accept whatever they said? Should we not think on our own regarding the appropriateness of their propositions?"

"Okay, let us think! Aren't there a beginning and an end to the matter? A mango tree germinates and also perishes. Are not the human beings born and die? Then, why to say that the matter does not have a beginning and an end? Where is the matter that perishes and the matter that remains forever? Which is that that has a beginning and an end and that that does not have either of them?"

"You are thinking very well. Within the perishing matters, the Philosophers say that there exist 'the elements' that do not perish."

"Sure, we will consider that. How did 'the elements' come about then?"

"Do not set that question against 'the elements'! The elements are the ones that do not have a beginning and an end, do they? Why ask how did they come about then? Let us presume that the specific matters such as the mango tree or the pebble are formed from the primordial elements with different shapes and characters, that these matters will perish after some time, and that the primordial elements will stay forever. Or else, what else can we presume?"

"Then, let us presume regarding the creator also the same way. Why can't we presume that the creator has no beginning or an end that the creator is the primordial matter, and that no one needs to create the creator?"

"Indeed, we could, if only we can see! Or, if only we can prove! If the creator is visible like the mango tree, then, the creator will not be a creator but will be a part of Nature. Then there would be no difference between the creator and Nature. The miraculous God will disappear, and the Nature consisting of the natural properties will remain."

"Leave alone the creator, we cannot deliberate regarding the one that cannot be proved. Let us leave that issue. Let us consider only 'the matter'. If we define the matter as the one 'that cannot come from the nothingness', have all the questions regarding the matter been answered?"

"The doubts cannot be clarified if we do not know how to understand them. All the matters that we find in Nature today did not exist in the same form in the previous phases. At one time there were no trees, no animals, and no human beings. In a phase before that, even the earth did not exist. And before that, the solar system did not exist. However, at that time the matters existed in a different form. The present day matters have evolved from the older matters. This is what we have understood using science. What may the sciences find through the experimentation in the coming times! We may grasp

tomorrow the truths that we cannot understand today. But, regardless of how many tomorrows we pass by, and regardless of how many truths are unraveled, would it ever be proved that at one time there existed no matter, that all the space was filled with the nothingness, and out of that nothingness the matter originated? We can find the emergence of one matter from another, but will it be proved that from the nothingness that did not exist anywhere, the matters have emerged? The natural sciences say that the planets have formed from the gas nebula. Will the sciences show that the gas had originated from the nothing-ness of the past times? I recall that a scientist named **Pierre-Simon Laplace** illustrated how the solar system emerged from the giant molecular cloud! And the astronomical sciences have confirmed these propositions."

"Alright, we are delighted to know that science confirmed this. But, how did the giant molecular cloud come about? Did Laplace explain this? At least, you tell me, how did the giant molecular cloud come about?"

"Alas, can I explain this? I am just a student. A big scientist will explain this tomorrow."

"In the meantime, you are telling me '*harikatha*' (mythical narration of the story of the god Hari= unreal story)! Previously, someone like you once said, "*I will tell Harikatha provided the folks from my village are not in the audience*! "

"That is not it. The issues related to the matter not yet understood today will come out. tomorrow. However, it will never be divulged that the matter has originated from the nothing-ness and that the older matters will perish completely, and newer matters would emerge from the nothingness. The sciences will find that the creators and the Universal Spirit are unreal and that the natural matters are real.

"If the matter is indeed eternal, then, when this earth perishes, a new earth will emerge. The suns and the moons will form again and again. The flora and fauna, the birds and the flowers, the children, and the humans, all will continue to exist. I feel delighted to think so."

"Not only that. The creator will merge with us! Is it not enticing?"

"I can see that time right now!

8. Can we understand the universe?

The philosophical inquiry began with the quest to understand the universe. The Philosophers have pondered over about the human society based on the scientific knowledge known to them, their personal experiences in the daily life, their worldly knowledge, and as well as imagination. The theories of Idealism and Materialism have originated from the quest to know the universe and the society.

These theories did not begin yesterday or the day before. They began a few thousand years ago, even before Christ, and are continuing to this day.

Idealism remained today in the same form as it existed a few thousand years ago. The creator of the universe, the universal spirit, the absolute spirit, the complete spirit, the absolute thought – these are some terms the Idealist philosophies use.

Materialism, on the other hand, grew to newer heights today since the days of its birth and continues to acquire newer elements of knowledge. Today, the Materialist thinking has dropped the creator completely.

'The matter or the human consciousness, which is first?' – This is the main question in Idealism and Materialism.

The other names for the consciousness are - the thought, the soul and the mind.

The other names for the matter are – Nature and the existence! 'Existence' means 'something present or in existence!'

The following are some questions that the Philosophy must answer:

Which is primary (first), the universe or the consciousness?

Is the consciousness due to the existence or the existence due to the consciousness?

Which is primary, Nature or the spirit (soul)?

Does the universe really exist externally, or does it exist only in the human thought?

All these doubts are different expressions of the same doubt. Although the debates have been going on for many years, a conclusion agreeable to all the philosophies hasn't been arrived as yet.

The answer according to Materialism:

The universe means Nature. It is natural. The human beings are also a part of Nature. The human beings perceive the natural concepts through the five sensual organs (*panchendriya*= the eye, nose, ear, tongue, and the skin). Even if one sense is lacking, they can still perceive Nature through the other four organs. The senses are the means that convey the external world to the brain. The external things the eyes see are the images made on the human mind. Only after that are the thoughts, opinions, and decisions!

The senses can perceive as external matters, not only those visuals the eyes see, the noises the ears hear, the flavors the nose smells, and the sensations the skin feels, but also the affairs of the human society. When the eyes of people witness the sight of a person clad in silk robes and adorned in jewelry riding a palanquin borne upon the shoulders of the carriers, the sight will transmit a few images to the mind and stimulate a few social impressions.

Nature is primary. The thoughts of the human beings are - secondary. The consciousness of the human being is the reflection of the physical world.

If you turn the Materialist thinking on its head, it would be 'Idealism'.

The answer according to Idealism:

The consciousness – is primary.

Nature— is secondary.

Idealism proceeds as follows:

'Why consider that the thoughts are conditional to the physical world? 'The ghost' is not a real thing or matter. We cannot see the ghost. Neverthe-less, why is there the idea of 'the ghost'? Has anyone ever seen a mermaid? Is the mermaid a real thing? Yet, why is there an idea

of 'the mermaid'? Is the digit 8 a matter of Nature? Does this matter exist anywhere? Is the digit 5 a thing? Why are there ideas about these digits although the corresponding matters do not exist? Did we see the planets in the sky? Yet, why do the ideas exist about the planets? Therefore, we need not infer that the ideas originate from the matter. The ideas are independent. When a man thought of making a plough, the plough did not exist at that time. Didn't the thought exist in the absence of the matter? Isn't the thought independent?' – This is how Idealism proceeds.

(The questions which Idealism asks are those which I read in Philosophy essays. The answers that followed the questions, however, are not from those essays. They are mine. They are not found in these essays.)

These are the deliberations of the Pullyyas and *Ellayya*s whose minds haven't matured in the least. Although there exists no 'ghost' in Nature, the thought of the ghost emerges from the element of 'fear'. The fear is due to some fact. The fear would not crop up without any reason or fact. Since the fear is real, the idea arising from the fear is 'the ghost'. The idea cannot be a thought formulated without a factual cause. As long as the fear persists, the ghost stories and the ghost images will perpetuate. When the fear disappears, the ghost also will disappear. If the ghost episodes remain even after that, these stories will only serve as the funny reminders of the past societies.

The 'mermaid' (*matsya kanya*) is an imagination. This imagination is similar to that of the 'creator'. Did the thought of the creator originate from the sight of the creator? That thought emerged without the corresponding matter, isn't it? Likewise, due to the fear of the non-existing, imagination of many kinds would arise. Those people who accept one kind of miracle will accept any number of miracles as a reality. This is how the mermaids, the celestial nymphs, and all the other fantasies originate.

Regarding the digits, there are 5 fingers on each hand. The

digit 'five' has emerged from this fact. The form of the fact is the digit five. When 10 ridge gourd cucumbers are hanging from the vein in the backyard, the digits have to emerge from the need to count the cucumbers. All the digits are the ideas that arise due to material facts. They do not arise without facts.

And, regarding the 'plough'? When some early digging gadgets of wood existed, based on that perception, the idea to improvise the tool further would emerge. The thought of a sophisticated tool cannot emerge, without there being a simple tool first. A new imagination can be formulated only based on the previous matter. In this manner, regardless of the numerous logical arguments put forward by Materialism, Idealism would not give up its stupid arguments.

The second contention between the two -isms is the question, 'whether or not we can understand the universe.'

Idealism: "We cannot understand,' says Idealism. It also says, 'We need not know.'

Materialism: 'This world is a physical world made of the matter. The matter is a real element. It is not a miracle. There is nothing impossible in understanding an element that exists in reality. 'The physical matter has no beginning and no end,' to grasp this fact amounts to understand Nature. As the scientific knowledge regarding the matter progressed, we have been able to know new facts hitherto not known. We do not know how the earth existed ten million years ago; but based on certain sciences, we could estimate. And, the facts not known today may be unraveled tomorrow or yet another tomorrow. To understand the physical matter existing, in reality, may be delayed, but not impossible. The knowledge gained through the sense organs such as the eyes, and the nose may not be sufficient enough to perceive the natural phenomena. We must add proper logic to this knowledge. Only thus proper knowledge can be acquired,' – This is how Materialism assumes.

During the process of development of the Materialist

thinking, there have been a few inconsistencies. For instance, there was a time when the thinking was unwilling to relinquish 'the supernatural power'. There was also a phase when the idea that, 'the knowledge gained using the five senses is a complete knowledge,' was prevalent. But, what the eyes could see may be true, or it may not be. We see every day that the sun rises in the sky in the east and sinks in the west and next day rises again in the east. Seeing this, if we infer that 'the sun revolves around the earth,' it would be fallacious. That means, in the case of the sun, what we see is not real. In this case, to gain appropriate knowledge, the fact the eyes see is not sufficient. When thinking blends with the fact, importantly, when the thinking is logical, then only, we can grasp the real truth.

'Seeing is believing,' to consider this way is to think the Materialist way, however, this cannot be true in every case. To consider something as factual as it is, would be only a partial Materialist thinking. This approach will not give the real knowledge.

There is another issue that the Materialism could not comprehend for a long time. It was the thinking that Nature as an entity is set in the final form that cannot undergo a further transformation, and would remain immutable forever in the form as is visible!

If one assumes that 'Nature has been formulated in the final form forever; that the sun would glow, the earth would revolve, and the stars would twinkle forever; that all these elements have remained in this state all the while; and that these elements will remain forever like this'— This amounts to faulty Materialism.

In Nature, there was a phase when even the single-cell living beings did not exist. There was a phase when even the earth did not form. Tomorrow, there will be a phase when the sun cools down. But, if we understand that 'the matter has no beginning or end,' then, we will realize that even when one sun has frozen, another sun will shine.

Another fallacy of the incomplete Materialist thinking is

the assumption that 'the human beings are not an integral part of Nature'. The thinking that every element in Nature would exist independently, on its own, and without inter-connections with others is erroneous. This blunder is the biggest of all; a huge ignorance devoid of common sense. The air the human beings breath comes from Nature. The food the human beings eat comes from Nature. Even if this much is understood, we will know that the human beings are a part of Nature. The human beings are held to the earth by the gravitational force and remain in an association that cannot break. The earth and the other planets are held by the gravitational force of the sun and revolve around the sun. And, the entire solar family is held in association with yet bigger celestial family using gravitational force. In the entire universe, there cannot be any element that is not in connection with another entity. The past Materialism, however, did not realize this fact.

In some aspects, the differences between Idealism and Materialism are blurred. An additional question that even the Materialist thinking failed to understand is 'whether or not the matter persists or perishes.' As the atoms are not visible to the naked eye; Idealism argues as follows: 'The fact that matter is not visible implies that matter has disappeared. The matter disappeared and transformed into absolute energy. That energy is the divine energy. That energy repeatedly reappears as matter and disappears again. That means the divine energy precedes the matter. The divine energy, not the matter, is the primordial (the primary) element. The dis-appearance of the matter proves the divine power'. This is Idealism.

At one time, even some Materialists had doubts such as, 'Do atoms really exist?' There were a few skeptic Materialists who considered 'believing in atoms is believing in witchcraft.' There were also a few other Materialists who considered the mind and its thoughts as matter since the brain is a matter. The Materialism in the past did not

have the capacity to clear those doubts. The doubts were cleared only after it was possible to take photos of the atoms.

Whenever the Materialist doctrine failed to provide a suitable answer, the Idealism used to feel proud that it won the victory. The Idealists argue that the matter keeps perishing because, if it is proved that the matter keeps perishing and new matter keeps emerging out of emptiness , they hope that they could argue that the creator can emerge from the nothingness.'

Idealism and Materialism do not exist at the same level in all countries. Even the superstitions are crude in some places and sophisticated in the other places. The people of some countries find Materialism quite unpalatable.

In Lenin's work '*Materialism and Emperio-criticism*', we can find answers to the questions raised on Materialism, up to the 20th century. (Not that I read Lenin's work. I read only the translation of essays written on that book.) Lenin counters the tenet that the disappearance of matter means the transfor-mation of the matter into the divine power.'

His argument will be along the following lines: If the matter does not appear to us, it does not mean that it (the matter) has turned into divine power not it means that the matter perishes. We can't see certain things with naked eyes. We see such things with the help of magnifying glasses. If we can't see such things by means of magnifying glasses, we will see those things with the help of more efficient instruments. If the atoms become much smaller parts, those smaller parts too constitute matter. If matter turns into energy (force/ power), the energy will be another form of the matter. It means solid substance turned into another form. We see the matter with naked eyes only when it is in the form of solid, liquid or glass. We also see the Sun rays but cannot see actions taking place in the Sun. Yet all those actions take place in the matter. Rays, waves, everything is matter. If matter changes from one form to another, it does not mean that matter perished or turned into a super power.—this

is how Lenin's explanation goes.

Not only Idealism but also Materialism of the past erred in not understanding these issues. That is why old Materialism had different names like crude Materialism, vulgar Materialism and so on.

'The universe is filled with matter. The matter has no beginning or end. The concept of matter is imperative for any natural science. Each natural science studies one or the other facet of the matter.' This is what is meant by understand-ing the universe.

'Idealism cannot understand properly even cats and dogs.' 'Why are there cats?' This sort of ridicule has been there with reference to the lack of proper understanding of Nature by Idealism. **Wolf**, an Idealist Philosopher, asks, 'To eat the mice. Then, why are there mice? For the cats to eat.'

If Materialism of the present day does not give up its Idealist features due to its ignorance, the same criticism will apply to it as well.

We must admit that the contemporary Materialism hasn't yet acquired the wisdom necessary to comprehend the universe and the human society that is an integral component of the universe. The reason is not that the natural sciences have not yet developed. Proper social science knowledge is not yet accessible to the people. The human beings exist not only in Nature but also in the society. In the absence of proper knowledge regarding the society, the material knowledge does not develop Until the social facts are understood, the faults and defects are inevitable in the Materialism.

★

9. The philosophers before Christ

Zoology can only be Zoology; it cannot be Philosophy. Botany can only be Botany; it cannot be Philosophy either. The theory of evolution discovered by Darwin is a natural science, not Philosophy. The secret of 'exploitation of labor' exposed by

Marx is a social science, not Philosophy. That social science which uncovered the real Nature of the human relations will and can provide correct Philosophy.

We see more thinkers in the domain of Philosophy than in any area of natural sciences. The Philosophers are not bound to prove what they propose. Therefore, any enthusiast can instantaneously transform into a Philosopher regardless of whether or not the doctrine makes sense! But he cannot become a scientist of Nature, This is how the godmen who preach trash to people gain popularity as Philosophers.

The Philosophers exist in all countries. There are many categories; Idealism, Materialism and many subcategories in each. There are Materialists who struggle to unify both Nature and the creator, make them stand together, and strike coherence between them. There are Idealists who disowned God and became atheists. There are Idealists who professed a few useful thoughts. Thus, there are several kinds of Philosophers.

We don't find women among the Philosophers. Anyway women are smart; they do not get into futile debates.

Let us look here at a few Philosophers who are known in the history.

Thales of Miletus: (Greek Philosopher, about 624 BC - 547 BC)

"The physical basis of the universe is water," proclaimed Thales. It may be inaccurate to propose water as the basis of the universe. Nevertheless, thinking about the 'basis', he proposed matter, not God, as the basis. He doesn't seem to have thought about the question, 'What would be the basis of water?' Had he thought about it, he would have said something that struck to his mind about the basis of water. Of course, even if he said something, again a different question would be waiting regarding the basis of that element, however. Some-where, therefore, we will have to stop being inquisitive of 'the basis'. A disciple of Thales proposed 'the air' as the basis of the universe. Instead of looking at the creator, both the teacher and the disciple proposed some kind of matter as

the basis of the universe. This was before Christ!

It would be nice if, those university professors of today who still cling to the miracles of the creator, look up to the teacher and his disciple who lived thousands of years ago and felt a little ashamed of themselves!

Heraclitus: (Greek Philosopher, 540 BC - 480 BC)

He proposed 'fire' as the basis of the universe. If anyone proposes a form of matter as the basis of Nature, it is the same as professing one matter being the basis of another matter. It is befitting. This proposition doesn't amount to equating the nothingness as the primordial matter. However, if one keeps asking 'What is the root of the primordial matter?' will the nothingness be the final thing?

This Philosopher proclaimed for the first time that 'everything in Nature keeps changing.' 'We cannot bathe in the same river twice. The water keeps flowing and changing,' – he was a good *Pullayya* to make this statement.

He makes this statement considering the water in the river. What would he say regarding the water in a well? Would he say now that 'Nothing in Nature moves?' His statement that 'nothing is permanent except change' was considered in the subsequent times as dialectical axiom. Thus, he became the first person to formulate a dialectical axiom. 'There is no creator,' he said further! That is not all. He also said that 'There exists conflict between elements in Nature.' We call 'the conflict' as 'the contradiction' today. This Philosopher made all these observations nearly 2,500 years ago!

In ascribing 'the flowing quality' to water, he, however, behaved like a child. (This is not the popular viewpoint of the philosophical writings that I read; this is my own impression!) The water flows downstream only on a terrain that has an altitude difference. The rain falling on the mountains flows down the rocks where there are lowlands. On a flat land, where would the water flow? The water in a pond or a well, where would it flow? Moreover, the property of flowing from a higher altitude to a lower

altitude is not unique to water alone; every fluid has this quality. If you overturn a casket of oil at a higher place, will not the oil run down the slope? Won't any other fluid behave the same way? Not the fluids alone, even the solid materials would do the same. What happens if you topple a casket full of pulses on a place that is uneven? The pulses will roll down the slope. If you unsettle a basket of cotton balls, the same thing will happen; the cotton balls will scatter downwards. Therefore, not only water, moving from a higher altitude to a lower one happens not only in the case of water but also in the case of all substances including that of the wind. The wind circling in the higher hills rushes to the lower plains.

Democritus: (Greek Philosopher, 460 BC - 370 BC)

He belongs to the middle strata of the slave masters. We do not know what he said regarding slavery, but on other issues, he expressed good opinions. 'Neither God nor the man did create the universe. The universe existed and will exist always,' he declared. 'Everything in Nature changes. Nothing is stable,' he said. That is not all, 'Every matter is a collection of atoms and sub-atoms. The atoms keep joining and separating. New sub-stances are formed always. The universe is filled with atoms and vacuum,' he added further. Scholars in the subsequent period concluded that what Democritus said constitute dialectical Materialism. (In 1841, for his Ph. D. thesis, Marx examined '*The differences between the Democritean and Epicurean Philosophy of Nature*.')

Plato: (Greek Philosopher, 427 BC - 347 BC)

Among the slave masters, he belonged to the aristocratic class. He is completely opposed to Materialism. The Nature that is clearly visible, he would call it as 'non-existing' (not real). 'The imaginary world (the world of thoughts) is the real one,' he said. 'The thoughts are real and fundamental. The things around us are the shadows of the thoughts,' he said. The readers need not struggle to under-stand these words. These are not the thoughts that can be understood. He defined the Republic of the

slave masters as the Ideal state. He unleashed wrath against the slaves. He described the works of Democritus as unholy writings. The Materialists and the atheists who do not accept the creator 'must be considered as dangerous criminals,' he said. (This means that the atheists already existed at that time!) He professed the death sentence to such people. There is not even a single progressive utterance in what all he said about Nature and the society. All of his views are opposed to progress. He could not learn anything from the Philosophers before him who taught many good things. The philistine did not realize that there will be people who would loathe him after 2,500 years! Some people cite few words indicating that Plato too desired Democracy. How a person, who defended the autocracy as an ideal state, would desire democracy? Whose advancement would it would be if one desires democracy for the autocrats? One progressive word amongst a thousand rubbish talks is not trustworthy.

Aristotle: (Greek Philosopher, 384 BC - 322 BC)

He was Plato's disciple! However, he was not completely subservient to the teacher. He opposed some ideas of the teacher. 'Nature does not depend on the thoughts of the human beings,' he said. 'There is mobility in the matters', 'It is possible to understand the universe', 'The essence of the things is embedded right in them. The things must be studied,' he said. Nevertheless, he was a disciple who apprenticed that worthless teacher, wasn't he? He, therefore, also said, 'God is the fundamental force driving the universe.' He was perhaps apprehensive that the teacher would pronounce the death sentence for him otherwise! He made contributions to many other disciplines but argued both ways. A disciple of that teacher learning this much is a little surprising nevertheless! Aristotle is said to be 'the father of Philosophy'. (No woman will be the mother or a cornerstone of any discipline ever. Of course, all the women make the cornerstones of the kitchen! Isn't

a woman churning out a delicious dish the cornerstone of the kitchen?) When other Philosophers who existed before him and professed a wiser thought, it is not clear why Aristotle is considered the father of Philosophy. The explanation is not available in the articles that I read.

While being critical of some thoughts of Aristotle, Marx and Engels praised him highly for his other ideas. Marx and Engels do not fail to recognize a merit in any person. I, however, could not find any information on what Marx and Engels said regarding Plato, and whether they scolded Plato and how strongly they scolded him.

The Charvakas: (Indian Philosophers, belonged to an era between the 4th and 2nd centuries before Christ)

These were Materialists. They did not accept the creator. They considered 'the earth, fire, wind, and water' as the basic elements of the universe. 'Every element existing in the world is made of four elements,' they said. 'The universe has its intrinsic principles. The universe evolves according to these principles,' they postulated. They refused the ideas of the Idealists that there is a soul in the body of the human beings and that there is a rebirth.

Kapila and the **Buddha** may be considered as good Philosophers among the thinkers of India. They too belonged to the times before Christ. The Materialists consider **Kapila** as 'the sage of the Vedic era'. (The time of his life is not known). All that he said constitutes Materialism. 'The super power called the creator is not acceptable,' he said. 'Anything that cannot be proved does not really exist,' he said (wonderful!). 'Anything real must be sensed by the senses,' he said (this is slightly erroneous.) 'The universe cannot be an integral reason by itself. It must have been formed for a different reason,' he said.

The whole argument of Kapila is marvelous. However, if 'a different reason' causes the universe, then, 'the other reason' would be an intrinsic part of the universe, won't it be? Won't the other reason also be the universe? We must consider that

the other element and the universe collectively constitute the 'total universe'. If that 'other element' is different, then, there must be a different cause underlying the other element too. No cause underlying the universe is found afresh, at the time of Kapila or today.

The Buddha: He is completely a Materialist. He did not accept any miracles or super powers. 'Since it is impossible to discern how Nature has come about, those attempts are unnecessary,' he said.

Shankara: (He belongs to the 8th century after, not before, Christ) 'When the darkness of ignorance engulfed, I considered the entire universe is real. When the wisdom dawned on me, I did not find any,' He is not among the Charvakas.

Epicurus: (Greek Philosopher, 341 BC - 270 BC)

Lucretius: (Roman Philosopher, 99 BC - 55 BC)

They are quite popular. They improvised the tenet of the atoms of Democritus.

In this manner, a few among the Philosophers before Christ sowed the early seeds of scientific knowledge regarding Nature.

During the time when the Materialism was progressing, the Idealism did not step backwards in defending itself.

'An intellectual' of the idealist school says the following: 'A sage sitting in a cave can see only the shadows of people wandering outside falling on the walls of the cave. The person in the cave cannot see the actual people outside. Likewise, the world that people see is not the real one. All this is only a shadow of the real world. The people can see only the shadow of the real world, but not the real world existing somewhere.'

What does this mean? While seeing a mango tree, we must consider that the tree is not the real tree and it is merely a shadow of the real tree! While eating a mango, we must consider that what we are eating is not the real mango fruit, but only the shadow of the fruit. If we do not consider the people who argue so are not 'insane', then, we will be proved to be insane ourselves.

If the entire world is a shadow of the real world, and if every element of the world is a shadow, then, a relation between any two shadows will be the real relation. To state that the real world exists somewhere else, and this world is only a shadow of the real world, would means that in the real world there exist the landlords, Capitalists, and all the others. It is impossible to believe that such mad Philo-sophers existed even during those times! But, they did exist yesterday! And, they do exist today!

Poor folks, did we understand them properly? I still have the doubt about this.

Lenin made a soft criticism of such kinds of Idealism as 'senseless'. Lenin is usually not so liberal. Instead of calling those arguments as insane, he confined to a few delicate words. We cannot find words in any language strong enough to berate the doctrines of Idealism. All we can say is 'a mad thinking' - a fallow phrase. There is not yet born a stronger word. Lenin too could not find a stronger word and sufficed with a simple abuse.

With the help of the rubbish propositions, the Idealism believes that it can defend and reinforce itself, even to this day.

The list of the Philosophers is not over yet. We have to see a few more.

★

10. The modern philosophers too fail to see the society

The Philosophers of different places and countries preach what they conceive. They are scattered in faraway places. One may not know what the other one said. One speaks of the same creator the other Philosopher spoke about. One defines the same properties of Nature the other Philosopher already spoke about. It amounts to saying the same thing which others have already said. However, there will be some differences.

Even those who speak about Nature from a Materialist perspective do not speak about

human relations of the society properly; they err. They view Master—Slave relations and Master-Labourer relations as those that form in Nature. They do not realize that the ideas of people are formed not only by the knowledge of Nature but also by the Nature of the production relations.

The ideas of the masters and slaves differ from each other depending on the conditions of each one. If the slave imitates the ideas of the master, such an imitation has its basis in the prevailing production relations in the society.

At a time when the 'exploitation of the labor' was not known, no one could have understood the human relations properly. The exploitation of labor was not exposed until the time of Marx. Until that time, whatever one talks about human society will not be correct but erroneous.

Now, as we move forward, let us take a glance at the Philosophers of the Christ era.

Nicolaus Copernicus:

(Poland, 1473 – 1543)

Before Copernicus, a scientist called **Ptolemy** proposed that the earth existed at the center of the universe, and the sun revolved around the earth. Copernicus rejected this proposition. It was Copernicus who proclaimed that it was not the sun that revolved around the earth, but it was the earth that revolved around the sun. He also stated that it was the sun, not the earth that was the center of the universe. This proposition seriously antagonized the religious leaders. The religious leaders believed that the earth was the center of the universe and the sun revolved around the earth. And, they preached this belief to the people. They thought that the teachings of Copernicus an affront that undermined the importance of the goddess earth. (The theory of Copernicus remained an assumption for 300 years. It was only after another scientist discovered a new planet that the propo-sitions of Copernicus have gained the level of a scientific theory.)

Copernicus rejected the idea of 'the creator' of the universe. He refuted Aristotle's teachings that 'the earth has no connection with the rest of the universe'. 'The religion should not interfere with the matters of

knowledge of Nature,' wrote Copernicus in his final days. Marx and Engels praised this as a great courageous and revolutionary act.

Giordano Bruno: (Italy, 1548 – 1600)

Galileo Galilei: (Italy, 1564 – 1642)

The two of them rejected the erroneous concepts that pervaded since the times of Aristotle. While supporting the proposition of Copernicus, they made a correction to his theory. They explained that the sun is the center of the solar system, not that of the universe. The religious fanatics imposed a nine-year incarceration on Galileo. The zealots imprisoned Bruno for eight years and then, burned him at the stake.

What the scientists such as Copernicus, Bruno and Galileo discovered are Natural Sciences and not Philosophies. The science of any kind will be considered only as philosophical assumptions until the proposition is scientifically proved.

Francis Bacon: (England, 1561 – 1626)

He was a Materialist. He did not accept the religion. 'One must gather the facts, study them, then, come to a conclusion,' he said. According to him 'research' must be performed only this way.

He is known to be the pioneer to introduce Materialist thinking to England. 'The Philosophy of Nature is the real Philosophy,' he said. 'Philosophy of Nature' means, an understanding dependent on the senses. 'Knowledge is the one that is acquired, after examining the information collected by all the senses, through a systematic and logical methodology,' he said. 'We can understand only that knowledge gained through the senses. Not otherwise,' he said.

Thomas Hobbes: (England, 1588 – 1679)

'The universe moves only due to physical causes, there is no superpower,' he said. He attempted to systematize the Materialist truths which Bacon proposed. 'There is a tendency in Bacon's teachings leading towards the creator,' he said. The statement 'what is not sensed by the senses cannot be understood' amounts to saying that 'we cannot under-stand God', he opined. The critics, however, believe that Hobbes' explanations

are mostly mechanical.

René Descartes: (France, 1596 – 1650)

He was a dualist. Partly Idealist and partly Materialist. He proposed that both the matter and the consciousness to be independent principles that make the basis of the universe. 'Every matter changes and there is motion,' he said. However, he did not elaborate on the motion. 'Rationality is the basis of the human wisdom,' he ascertained which means to say that only by rational thinking knowledge can be acquired. He is considered to be 'the pioneer of the rationalism.'

Baruch Spinoza: (The Netherlands, 1632 – 1677)

He was a Materialist. 'There is but one basis for every element in the universe, that is, Nature.' He said. 'Nature is the one no one created,' he said. 'The universe develops according to its principles. The universe alone is the basis of the universe,' he said. That means for the formation one matter another one will be the basis. He was highly critical of the Idealism in Descartes. He turned himself into a complete atheist. In those days, the word 'Spinozist' was equivalent to 'atheist'.

Bishop George Berkeley: (Anglo-Irish religious head, 1684 – 1753)

He was a staunch adversary to Materialism and atheism. 'The Materialists and atheists must be punished and tortured,' he proclaimed. 'The entire world around us has originated from the consciousness of the human beings. All the things are the conglomeration of the reception of the senses,' he said. 'Only the religion-less morons cling to 'the matter.' The concept of 'matter' must be prohibited entirely,' he pronounced. 'Some external element is influencing us. I agree with you that there exists an external element. However, you call the external element 'the matter' and I call it 'the supreme soul or spirit,' he affirmed. 'Except in the human thought, there is no external world. Whatever is there in human thought, it exists. What is not in human comprehension does not exist,' he added.

Those who believe in the creator say, 'it is the creator who created this universe', don't they? That means that the 'universe exists, doesn't it?

Then, why do the same people say that there is no universe and what humans see is not the universe?

Seeing this mad rant, the Materialists should consider that remaining silent is the best way. There are college lecturers and the university professors sport sacred threads on the arms, magical rings on the fingers, and the garlands of Rudraksha beads! We witness so many such things today. Then, instead of maintaining silence, why should we get angry at religious elders of past centuries? As long as it is only an empty talk, without resorting to cruel acts, to mind them would be a waste of time.

David Hume: (Scotland, 1711 – 1776)

He completely agreed with the ideas of Bishop Berkeley. He too refused to recognize the physical world. According to him, apart from the sensual experience, there is no other reality for the human being. Thus, he adopted both the Idealist and Materialist thinking simultaneously.

Lenin, in his writing, was severely critical of both Berkeley and Hume.

In the 17th century, though the bourgeois revolution became victorious, Capitalist class compromised and joined hands with the class of the landlords. To suit this, the Idealism remained intact. The observers, however, claim that in the 18th century, a strong foundation was laid countering the religion and feudalism. During this century, Philosophers such as Detarat, Baron d'Holbach, Claude Adrien Helvétius, have developed the theoretical ideology necessary for the French bourgeois revolution of 1789. Although all of the theoretical formulations developed by them were not proper, these ideas inspired the revolution immensely.

'There is no beginning or end to the matter. We cannot create an element of matter without having access to another piece of matter. We cannot destroy the existing matter for ever,' concluded a few Russian Philosophers and scientists in the 18th century. They vigorously rejected the belief of the Idealists that there exists a soul in the human body, that the soul would escape from the body after death, and that

the soul has no death.

Regardless of the countless number of revolutions that happened elsewhere, in Britain a place of the bourgeois revolution, there are still kings and queens sitting on the throne even today! The working people there are mesmerized gossiping regarding the love affairs of the kings and the queens!

John Locke: (England, 1632 – 1704)

He was a Materialist. An economist and Philosopher who depended on worldly knowledge. 'There cannot be a Philosophy that contradicts with the sensual experience of a healthy human being and the logical reasoning,' he said. 'The ideas should be subject to logic,' he added. 'The mind is first like a blank paper. When the senses are activated, the thoughts spring to the mind,' he stated. Locke also said that Nature, which is the place of living of human beings, has provided a natural condition in which all the people toil on the earth without a Master-like authority.

He proposed the responsibilities that the human beings ought to carry and the rights they must have.

According to Locke, 'The constitution came into being only after the formation of property.' (It is not enough to say 'after the formation of property.' We must say, 'after the formation of property acquired by means of exploitation of labour.' However, during his time, the fact of exploitation of labour was not yet discovered. Since it was discovered by Marx, it would be unfair to say that Philosophers before Marx did not talk about exploitation of labour.)

Locke also said that the state has emerged to protect the property earned from labor and to defend freedom.

(It is wrong to say so. If everyone performs labour, each will have limited resources earned out of their labor such as house and a piece of land. No harm would come up on these resources from others. In fact, these resources should not be called 'property.' No government will be needed to protect them. Only to protect a property appropriated by exploitation, a government equipped with arms will be required. In the history of the society, an armed

government was formed for the first time during the times of the slave masters.)

A few good words of John Locke:

'There is no need to understand each and everything in Nature or the society. A working knowledge necessary for routine life would be sufficient.'

(These are good words, however, these words are valid only in a society where everyone performs labour. These good words do not apply to a society of the exploiting classes that is obsessed with profit. The sellers of various kinds of commodities need the knowledge of all sorts of sciences for the making of the conditions. They need the sciences to dig out all the metals from other planets. They need the sciences to make rockets to ferry tourists to the stars. It would not be appropriate to say 'a working knowledge necessary for routine life' without realizing the presence of the exploiting classes in the society that extract profits by selling commodities. Nevertheless, since Locke was not aware of exploitation of labour during his time, we should take only the good things from his sayings without finding fault with his words.)

Locke: 'If the existing social system fails to provide opportunities for education and development of individuals, people should change the system. And they will change it.

A few French Materialists welcomed Locke's doctrines as if welcoming a long-awaited guest. Perhaps there was no one else until then to utter a few good words.

According to Marx and Engels, Locke's Philosophy appeared in support of the forthcoming bourgeois revolution of England against the feudal rule (a reference to the English revolution of 1688 – 1689).

Pierre Bayle: (France, 1647 – 1706)

He was a university professor. He argued against the Catholic religious strictures. He examined the stories of Christianity and concluded that they were full of myths and concoctions. 'The human beings should not pay attention to the religion. They must mind the ethics,' he advised. 'It is possible that in a society all can be atheists. There is no need for religion,' he ascertained. He founded an

atheist connection. 'To pray to God, the idol worship and superstitions are acts of people humiliating themselves,' he argued.

Immanuel Kant: (Germany, 1724 – 1804)

He was a university professor. He preached partly Idealism and partly Materialism. (Some of the university professors are precisely like this.)

Although he is called 'a dualist', he should be considered as an Idealist in essence. He was influenced by Hume's doctrines. 'Thanks to Hume, I woke up from the deep slumber of dogmatism,' he admitted. (Had he remained in the deep slumber until Marx's arrival, and then woke up, he would have indeed become a good intellectual.) He was quite reputed as a great intellectual. He described a lot of issues regarding the sun.

One of his books that appeared in 1755 brushed aside the proposition that 'Nature originated out of an initial energy.' Kant rejected 'the initial energy' hypothesis and ascribed 'evolution' to Nature. 'The earth and the solar system may have formed at different phases of the time. We should not consider that the entire universe has originated at a single time,' he said. 'It would be sheer ignorance to think that the earth with all the oceans, forests, mountains, the animals and the human beings has appeared spontaneously,' he added.

He was the Philosopher to state that, 'The entire universe must have begun with the nebula gas and luminous clouds (with some matter, not the supernatural power).' 'The star called the sun is also not eternal. There are many more stars in the universe apart from the sun' he added.

(What existed before the nebula gas? And what existed before that earlier matter? These old questions resurface repeatedly.)

There are critics who support or oppose the nebula theory. Engels, observed that the natural scientists did not pay attention to the Kant's argument that 'the entire universe did not originate spontaneously at the same time,' and they wasted a lot of time by not examining this doctrine from the perspective of 'evolution'.

Johann Heinrich von Mädler, a scientist who 100

years after Kant, said that 'there exists no evolutionary process for Nature; no phase of Nature follows the other,' he rejected an evolutionary process for Nature entirely. Until the time the geographical sciences have developed, and people realized that the different layers of the earth have formed at different phases, the scientists did not accept the process of evolution. Even then, **Currier**, a Philosopher reiterated that 'the Lord created the different layers of the earth at different times according to his will.' Eventually, all the scientists accepted the process of evolution. It is said that 'The ideas of Kant regarding the universe played a major role in formulating dialectics.'

Kant ridiculed the idea of spirituality (the idea of the creator). 'There must be a cause underlying the effect,' he asserted the cause-and-effect relation. He provided a few examples. 'Adding 5 to 7 makes 12. How did we get 12? It came with the addition of two different elements. That means, 12 is formed by two other underlying entities,' he argued. (However, he did not explain the underlying cause of nebula.)

A person who explained the cause-and-effect with such great clarity, did not provide a rational answer to the question 'how is knowledge acquired?' Instead of saying 'by observing Nature,' he said 'all by the human brain.' This can mean that the human brain is primary without any connection with Nature. Although observing Nature is done through the brain, the brain can observe Nature only when Nature exists first. We must, therefore, consider Nature as the primordial entity.

Kant: 'What we call a physical object (say a tree) is a collection of some ideas,' said Kant. How to understand this statement? We cannot be so unreasonable and consider the statement as an interpretation to state that, 'object forms due to human ideas.' What else can be the meaning of this statement? When we see a mango tree, many diverse thoughts come to our mind; 'This is a mango tree. It looks like a Banaganapalli variety. It grew amply. The tree has not yet flowered,' a few thought like this. But, do we consider that the tree is a combination of only these few features and no other

features? We do not think so. Don't we know that the tree possesses many more features about which we are not aware? What is the intention of the statement that 'a tree is a collection of our ideas?' When we have only two or three ideas regarding an object, will these few ideas make 'the entire collection of ideas?' This is the reason why 'Idealism' is considered incomprehensible forever. It is not possible for me to understand it.

This Philosopher says another thing: 'Reality depends on our mind; it is not outside the mind.' What is mind, the brain or the soul? What meaning should we attribute to the mind? If it is brain, it is matter. If it is soul, it is not matter. When the brain receives a pulse of reality from the external world, the brain will understand the Nature of that reality, based on the knowledge already acquired. We have to first depend on the external reality, isn't it? Although the final inference is based on the understanding of the brain, the external reality will have an important role.

Kant leaned more towards 'experiences'. Regarding God, freedom and morality he said that 'we cannot conclude anything about them.' In the sense that everyone has his own experience! One can say that 'God exists or does not exist. By logic, he does not exist; by faith, he exists,' he said. Is this something a university professor should argue? A *Pullayya* sitting under a tree would be more assertive, 'Who says there is no God? Stupid thing to say! God always existed and will exist forever,' he would be unequivocal in his opinion. He would not talk two different ways. *Pullayya* knows that taking two different ways is wrong.

But, the 'Kant-*Pullayya*' is very smart. Moreover, being a professor he is quite self-assured! He talks both the ways regarding 'morality' and 'freedom.' 'What is immoral for you may be moral for others. What is freedom for you may not be freedom for others.' This is how it goes! That means he would look at everything and anything in isolation as if matters apply differently to separate individuals.

In the case of Master-Labourer relationships, interests of one class are opposed to those

of another class. What is unjust to the slave would be just to the slave master. What is right to the slave master would be the lack of right to the slave. The same fact applies to the Master-Worker relations! Also applies to Man-Woman relations. The morality of the man in all the societies existed until today is immorality to the woman. The rights of the man are the denial of the rights of the woman. That means, only when two human beings are not held in an equal relationship, something good to one would be bad to the other. In contrast, when two human beings are bound in an equal relationship, the good and bad are equally applicable to both of them. Not just to the two, but to all. In such a context, what is immoral to someone cannot be moral to someone else. A good thing would be good for all and a bad thing bad for all.

However, no Philosopher is concerned with the prevailing human relations in the society. They are worried about the events happening in the sun, but not on the earth. They will explore the nebula gas swirling in the sky, but not the atrocities of the flesh trade prevailing on the earth. Unmindful of the earthly matters, they formulate philosophical discourses.

Kant described a few issues too erratically. 'We may consider that God exists or we may not. We may know God or we may not,' he continued further. There would be nothing inappropriate in saying that,' we may understand a few things and may not understand a few other things.' Kant's explanation, however, does not belong to this category. 'Something unethical for someone may not be unethical for others,' a statement such as this will only strengthen the hands of unscrupulous people. 'Do not preach your ethics to me. What you see as immoral is moral for me. Don't attempt to impose your morality on me. My morality is mine. Read what Kant said,' they would retort.

Kant's another maxim of peace: 'For the peace to prevail between different countries, there must be international trade between the countries. The goods of one country should be sold to the other. In

such a situation, the relations between countries will be peaceful since the two sides are mutually dependent on each other,' – this is the maxim of peace!

Did international trade not exist between countries during the lifetime of this professor? Did conflicts not exist between countries? In spite of the trade, why peace did not prevail? Did these questions not occur to the professor?

Such tendencies were prevalent as a result of the weak German bourgeoisie that lagged behind the other capitalist countries due to a multitude of frailties, say Marx and Engels. 'There are a few exceptional material aspects in Kant. And these qualities must be noted,' they add.

Not only regarding Nature, but also regarding the society, there are a few exceptional qualities in Kant. ★

11. The philosophers who fascinated Marx and Engels!

Georg Wilhelm Friedrich HEGEL: (Germany, 1770 – 1831)

He was an Idealist. However, the critics say (or write) that his Idealism is not like that of the olden times and that it is unique. When we attempt to read the original writings of any of these Philosophers, there is nothing much that we can understand. Even if we read an interpretation of the writings of a Philosopher (of course the translations), we cannot comprehend much either. Nevertheless, we must discuss a little of that we learned from these attempts.

Even if there is some 'greatness' in the Philosophy of Hagel, isn't it 'Idealism' after all? Why talk 'greatly' of his thinking? Leaving the 'greatness' alone, let us consider what this Idealism professes.

According to Hegel, the basis of the universe is 'the universal spirit'. The second name of this concept is 'an absolute idea'. The third name, 'an absolute spirit'. And, the fourth name, 'a supreme spirit'. Probably there must be some more names. But, I could not

find them. As we give nicknames to children, all these are nicknames of the absolute spirit.

The universal spirit already existed before the universe! It existed freely! (The spirit, more so the absolute spirit indeed must have independence.) Do not ask the Philosopher 'where does the absolute spirit exist?' 'Everywhere,' says the Philosopher. If asked, 'will you show us the universal spirit?' he would answer, 'Why, don't you have eyes? Must I show you? Look yourself!' We will have to shut up unless already prepared with the answers, how could the Philosopher talk about the universal spirit? If asked, 'how do you know that the universal spirit exists?' he will not answer how he knew, but would say, 'I say because I know. Trust me if you like or don't.' When there are people prepared to believe anything said, the Philosophers will reinforce their beliefs.

According to Hegel, the universal spirit and Nature are not two different things. Nature is another form of the universal spirit. The idea of the universe thinks about itself through the mediation of the human being. (Well, the universal spirit found the human being quite handy. Perhaps I am interpreting wrongly! This is how I understand this. I have been lamenting from the beginning that I don't understand any of these Idealist thoughts. I make myself into believing that I understand, even if not understood! The context is such a one.)

The real cock-and-bull story of Hegel: 'The absolute spirit already existed even prior to the creation of Nature and the human beings. The consciousness of that absolute spirit is the basis of the universe.' – Can the ordinary folks ever understand this concept? We can find many idle stories like this in this Philosopher.

To see how Marx understood this Philosopher, let us consider a few statements of Marx.

> "To Hegel, the life-process of the human brain, i.e., the process of thinking, which, under the name of "the idea", he even transforms into an independent subject, is the demiurgos of the real world, and the real world is only the external phenomenal form of "the idea". With me, on the contrary, the ideal is nothing

else than the material world reflected by the human mind, and translated into forms of thought." (*Capital-1*, page29, Moscow edition, 1974)

There is nothing new in these words. This is what Materialism always been arguing opposing the Idealist Philosophy. Marx says that 'an idea' is a thought born in the mind of the human being; the idea comes from a material source. It is not that Marx and Engels did not recognize the fallacious Nature of Hagel. They realized from the very beginning.

According to Hegel, every matter in Nature is a form of the universal spirit. The universal spirit creates a grain of sand or the star sun. This entire real world is the external manifestation of the absolute spirit.

If we ask 'We can see all the elements of the real world, the trees, rivers, mountains, the stars and the moons, all. Then, why the universal spirit is not visible?' (It is waste to ask, but if we do), the Philosopher would answer, 'all are the forms of the universal spirit, therefore, seeing any of them is seeing the universal spirit. Should we see the universal spirit separately?'

If we say, 'you said that the universal spirit is 'free', didn't you? We would like to see that spirit once,' he would retort, 'then, see the sand. That is the universal spirit. See the hill. That is the absolute spirit!'

Then we say, 'Let us call the sand the sand; the hill the hill. Why such names as the universal spirit and the absolute spirit that are difficult to pronounce?'

He would say, 'That is the basis. Recognize the forms only after realizing the basis. Your 'tongue' is also a form of the universal spirit. Why can't it pronounce? Can't your tongue pronounce like mine? Learn how to use your tongue to pronounce!' he would admonish.

'Sure, I shall learn. But, I am not as intelligent as you are, am I? Hegel, please be patient! Do you call 'the matter' the universal spirit? Then, everything will be okay.'

'What are you talking? The universal spirit is a great power! The matter is born out of the benevolence of the spirit. How can both of them be the same?'

'When we can see the 'the child,' named 'matter' then, we should also see its mother. Or,

is the mother gone?'

'What nonsense? How can the universal spirit be gone?'

Can these arguments reach anywhere or can they ever conclude? It is not wise wasting time. Our life is short even if it spans a hundred years. There are many more things yet to learn. We should abandon the universal spirit and move forward. The universal spirit will follow us wherever we go. It is universally pervasive, isn't it?

With reference to the universal spirit, we don't find much difference between the old Idealism and the new Idealism. However it is said that 'Hegel developed many aspects of dialectical Materialism.'

Actually, what is 'dialectics'? Dialectics involves logic based on the under-standing that every matter is always in motion. For instance, Engels observes, 'Motion is the mode of existence of matter. Never anywhere has there been matter without motion, or motion without matter nor can there be.' There exists motion in matter. The matter changes.' If this represents the tenet of dialectical Materialism, then, even the earlier Philosophers professed this idea. There are, however, not many details regarding the older tenets. The critics acknowledge that Hegel defined the older tenets with greater clarity, and proposed additional tenets. A few followers of Hegel believed that owing to Hegel, the Philosophy improvised immensely and even reached its zenith.

Hegel's followers admit that whatever Hegel said was from the perspective of the universal spirit, and the absolute idea, but not keeping in view Nature and the human society. Even Marx and Engels were impressed with the propositions of Hegel that these tenets are progressive; relevant to Nature, the society and the thought process; and that using these principles all aspects can be understood. (There are other chapters in this book that discuss Hegel's propositions. Here, we will confine to a brief summary.)

'The change and the development happen all the time,' this is the essence of Hegel's tenets! The changes happen in which aspect? In 'the thought' would be the answer. It means that the changes and development take place in the

thought. Engels called the tenets of Hegel 'the Laws of Thought.' (We will consider these Laws in other chapters.)

According to Marx and Engels, as Hegel's Philosophy has always applied the change and development to 'the idea', it became Idealism. Marx and Engels believed that if correct axioms are added to Materialism, it would overcome its short-comings and develop further.

Among the followers of Hegel, there were and are both rightists and leftists. Those who agreed with the rightist and leftist tendencies of Hegel's thought have split into reactionaries and leftists, respectively. Marx and Engels were among the adherents of the second kind.

If a writer or a Philosopher preaches two types of ideas: good and bad, rightist and leftist thoughts, the followers would also split into two kinds. While a few of the followers would adapt the positive ideas, the other will take to the negative thoughts. Due to the contradiction in the leader as well as in his teaching, a difference between the followers will emerge. If the preacher is consistent in his teachings, preaching only one kind of ideas, some of the followers adopt only one kind of ideology. Those disagreeing with the ideas will abandon the ideology. But if the preacher preaches two contrasting ideas, the followers will be of two kinds.*

Why would any person preach positive and negative ideas blended into one? The person may not be able to differentiate between the good and bad things. The person may be aware of a few things and unaware of the other things. Else, the person may have diehard beliefs and habits due to which he cannot abandon the

*The Telugu writer Chalam fits this description perfectly. His writings as well as his practice have both positive and negative aspects. While some of his readers embraced his positive aspects, the others adapted his negative aspects. However, one of the two contradicting characters will be the dominating quality of such people. The conflicting qualities will not be in equal proportion in anyone. If we observe a person with two different aspects, only one aspect will be dominant. Both kinds of aspects will not be equal.

★

negative aspects. When one attempts to preach things which he does not know fully or does not believe strongly or does not give up fully, his writings or his Philosophy will not be consistent, and will be contradictory.

When they did not yet meet each other, and when they were still not out of their twenties, Marx and Engels did not like Hegel's writings. Nevertheless, influenced by the propaganda around Hegel and his attraction, limited by the analytical power that they possessed at that time, they became his followers but with some amount of criticism. Considering Hegel as a leftist, they became his leftist followers.

In the subsequent years, under the influence of the writings of Feuerbach that were severely critical of the Hegel's Idealism, Marx and Engels have become Materialists fully. Nevertheless, they did not reject the specialty of Hegel's tenets.

The incidence of Marx identifying himself as the disciple of Hegel happened at a later time. When there raged a serious attack on Hegel ignoring the progressive elements of his ideas, unable to tolerate this, Marx declared himself as Hegel's disciple and explained the specialty of Hegel.

We will see some of these details in another chapter.

Ludwig Feuerbach:

(Germany, 1804 – 1872)

He was a university professor. In the beginning, he was Hegel's follower for some time. Gradually, he matured into a Materialist. He passionately opposed the Hegelian idea that 'the absolute idea is the basis of Nature.' (For simplicity we will call him Bach).

Although 'Idealism' was older than Hegel in Germany, Bach's criticism was mainly focused on the Hegel's Idealism.

According to Hegel, Nature is a manifestation of the supernatural power, called the absolute idea. The idea formed out of thinking is primary; Nature is secondary. (This is the old Idealism.)

In fact, to whom 'the idea' belongs? To the human beings? Which human being? Each human being may think differently. Is Nature according to the human thinking? If Nature comes from the absolute Idea, how the human thought can

conceive Nature that originated from such a supernatural power? Is it not self-contradictory to consider as such? Engels observes that Bach exposed such short-comings of the Hegel's Idealism and it amounts to dismissal of Hegel's Philosophy.

Bach embedded all the criticism in his book called '*The Essence of Christianity*' (1841). Engels acknowledged that after studying the critique, they (Marx and Engels) became disciples of Bach. (Engels said this in an article of 1886 written on Bach's book. Marx was not alive at the time of writing of this review. Marx passed away in 1883.)

Although Materialism coexisted with Idealism at this time in Germany, Idealism had an upper hand. Most people followed Idealism. The attraction for Idealism increased immensely following Hegel's writings. It was at this time that the Bach's missile of criticism descended on the Hegel's Idealism.

Bach argued that the so-called 'supernatural powers' were merely imaginary and unreal; that Nature did not form out of any supernatural power, and that Nature was independent. 'We, the human beings, have imagined the supernatural powers, and the superior godly forms,' argued Bach.

Bach: 'Nature alone is the basis. Nature is the cause of the human being and the consciousness of the human being. The Philosophy that cannot appreciate the significance of Nature is useless. A concept called Philosophy should not divide the human being into two components – the body and the soul. We must consider both as one.'

Bach: 'Like all the other Idealist philosophies, the Hegel's Philosophy is also religious. Both religion and Idealism are false and reactionary.' Thus, Bach waged many a criticism against the Hegel's Idealism.

Engels portrays Bach's critique in his writing of 1886 as follows:

> "Then came Feuerbach's Essence of Christianity. With one blow it pulverized the contradiction, in that without circumlocutions it placed Materialism on the throne again. Nature exists independently of all Philosophy. It is the foundation upon which we human beings, ourselves products of Nature, have grown up Nothing exists

> outside Nature and man, and the higher beings our religious fantasies have created are only the fantastic reflection of our own essence. The spell was broken; the "system" was exploded and cast aside, and the contradiction, shown to exist only in our imagination, was dissolved. One must himself have experienced the liberating effect of this book to get an idea of it. Enthusiasm was general; we all became at once Feuerbachians. How enthusia-stically Marx greeted the new conception and how much—in spite of all critical reservations — he was influenced by it, one must read in The Holy Family. Even the shortcomings of the book contributed to its immediate effect. Its literary, sometimes even high-flown, style secured for it a large public and was at any rate refreshing after long years of abstract and abstruse Hegelianising." (*Ludwig Feuer-bach and the End of Classical German Philosophy*. Moscow edition, 1973)

After reading Engels state-ment that "we all became at once Feuerbachians", one must get a doubt. In 1841 when Bach's book appeared, Marx was 22 and Engels 20. They did not yet meet each other. It is not clear whether both of them read that book as soon as it came out or after few years or who among the two read it and when they read it. We don't find these details in Engels' book. These details are necessary because if they read the book as soon as it came out, we will know that they read it when they were still young, and if they read the book after a few years, they would be a bit more mature. (As these details were not there in Engels's book, I saw 1973 Moscow edition of '*Karl Marx: A Biography*'. From this it is clear that Marx read Bach's book in 1842, and he also wrote a critique of that work. It was in 1844 that Marx wrote '*The Holy Family*.' In addition to the critique written soon after reading Bach's book, Marx noted down 11 additional comments/Theses in 1845.)

By 1842, Marx and Engels knew each other, and they shared identical views. What did these two friends, who read Bach's book and became his followers, learn from that book? What they learned must have

been Bach's Materialism. If we assume that Marx read these writing when he was 23, was he not a staunch Materialist until he read that book?

If Bach proclaimed that there was 'no supernatural powers', these ideas were already expressed by some Materialists in other countries. Well, then what was novel in Bach?

From Engels' words, we understand that there already existed Materialism in Germany by that time, although it was a little backward, and that Bach revived the backward Materialism.

What is the meaning of the statement "we became Feuerbachians"? This means that the two friends were in a state lower than that of Bach in understanding the shortcomings of the Hegel's Philosophy. It is a different matter when one says, "We liked that book. Liking a book doesn't imply that readers are at a level lower than that of the writer. Engels said that they 'became Feuerbachians.' Becoming followers could only mean that the readers of a lower level learning from the writer of a higher level. To say that 'Marx was immensely impressed with Bach's writing…' can only mean that Marx and Engels acquired a staunch Materialist outlook from Bach. Although this did not mean that the two friends believed in the supernatural powers until that time, they certainly did not seem to possess an adequate Materialist perspective.

'From *The Holy Family* we can understand how much Bach's book influenced Marx', says Engels. These words can mean that Marx wrote 'The Holy Family' on Bach. But it is not so. 'The Holy Family' contains philosophical issues and criticisms on religious matters. We therefore have to assume that Marx wrote this work under the influence of Bach.

In 1845, Marx made notes consisting of 11 points with an appraisal on the works of Bach and with an intention to write a full critique later. One who was influenced by Bach was able to make critical comments on the perspectives of Bach!

The critique of Feuerbach on Hegel was similar to the ones made by some earlier Materialists. However, Bach's criticism is more detailed and more logical. Feuerbach totally rejected the Idealist concept that a soul existed in the human

body, that it was eternal, and that it had no end (death). Likewise, he also rejected the Idealist notion that the human beings 'cannot understand the universe.' The earlier Materialists had also made these critical observations. Then, what was the uniqueness of Feuerbach? As Engels said, unless we read the works of Bach, we will not understand. We have to read and experience it.

Bach: 'However extrasensory the notions of our conscience and our thought may appear, they are only born from the brain which is an integral part of the body. The matter does not originate from the idea. The idea itself is the highest creation of the matter!' – This is how Bach argued.

Engels cites these statements of Bach and adds, 'Bach who traveled this far, stalled there. He could not overcome the traditional misconceptions'.

What was the misconception that Bach could not overcome? Bach offered his own definition to the religion, 'my interpretation of Materialism is different,' he said. This does not mean that he accepted the supernatural powers.

A novel concept which Feuerbach proposed: 'The human society definitely needs a religion, a faultless religion.' The religion of Bach, however, was not for tying the human beings to God; and not to make them believe in God. The religion of Bach was for promoting the human relations consisting of prosperity and happiness! The religion must have the code of conduct necessary to promote happiness in human relations. The human beings must love one another. The human beings must lead a life of love, friendship, and ethics. If a religion of such ethical conduct prevails, the human society will sustain itself in peace and happiness. This was the new religion of Materialist love that Bach invented! A religion that Bach considered to be 'devoid of defects.'

The 'religion of love' that Feuerbach preached must depend on the hearts of the human beings, but not on the factual relations prevailing in the real society. Feuerbach did not bother about the material facts that existed in the external society such as the Master and

Labourer relationships. The new religion of Feuerbach implies that 'the Master and the Labourer must live in mutual love and affection'.

Love, friendship and selfless sacrifice, have always existed in the society. Feuerbach, however, did not realize where they are possible and where they are not. Bach preached that such good qualities must remain as religious edicts and that the human beings must honor such edicts! Bach did not consider how it would be possible for the human beings to honor such edicts.

Feuerbach lived at the same time as Marx and Engels. He heard of the writings of Marx. Don't know if he read them! Certainly, he did not approve of the writings. He desired to achieve socialism through love and not struggle. In fact, what Bach perceived was 'a principle of love,' not socialism.

If the Master loved the Labourers, he might hike the wages of the workers by a few paise. Feuerbach was not aware of 'the surplus value' that the Master gets. In the society that Bach lived, there existed all: the exploitation by Capital, the speculation business, the interest and profit, begging, prostitution. Bach witnessed all of these. Yet, he failed to understand these maladies. The human beings must live in love! This was the wisdom of the university professor!

As he wrote books rejecting the creator and loving the Materialism, Bach, the preacher of love, lost his job. This Materialist did not realize why it was a crime to say that 'the supernatural powers do not exist', and why it was a crime to say that 'the universal souls are not real.'

Let us assume that the religious people asked the atheists regarding their religion and the atheists answered thus, 'we don't have religion, we are atheists' 'So, that is your religion,' the religious people would surmise incapable of leaving the religion out of their lives! Feuerbach assumes that the different historical phases of the society formed from different religions. In his critique, Engels explains that this assumption was not factual.

Feuerbach adores the notion of 'religion' because he intensely believed that the idea

of religion binds the human heart. If a good religion is formulated, the human heart will live in peace! If this is true, the human beings may trust that in future, the human heart will surrender itself to communism willingly.

'The writing of Bach applauding the religion of love are not useful to the society in the least,' says Engels.

The essence of the criticisms of Marx and Engels on Bach: 'Feuerbach claimed that we can understand Nature from the Materialist viewpoint. He, however, failed to understand the human society and its history from the Materialist perspective. Feuerbach did not comprehend the material facts of the society and dreamed of an imaginary society. From that angle he was an Idealist', Marx and Engels commented.

Although towards the end of his life, Feuerbach joined the Social Democratic Party, he did not approve of Marxism.

In his essay, Engels praised that 'Feuerbach discarded the Hegelian Philosophy'. But, in the same essay writing Engels nevertheless praised Hegel immensely! Engels was even critical of Bach that he ignored the worthy teachings of Hegel.

The 11 points (theses) that Marx wrote down after reading the book of Feuerbach were not sufficiently simple. Moreover, the faults of the translators (from English to Telugu) complicated the style further.

Have a look at the following sentence regarding point 1: "....." (I cited the sentence in the Telugu original of this book as it was in the Telugu translation of Marx's Theses on Feuerbach. In the translated sentence, the prepositions/case suffixes and conjunctions / coordination markers were not used appropriately where necessary. Even if these were used appropriately, the sentence is not in a form that it can be understood. I thought of correcting the sentence to highlight the errors, but I did not know how to make these corrections.)

If one fails to understand the first sentence, what is the use of proceeding into the subsequent sentences? What will happen if we don't proceed? There will be a lot to learn from

the 11 points that Marx has written down. Nevertheless, I do not trust that we can really understand the 11 points even after spending 11 hours. We, therefore, will skip many of these points.

Some good expressions of Marx which we often come across appear in his critique of Bach.

> **Point 3**: The Materialist doctrine concerning the changing of circumstances and upbringing forgets that circumstances are changed by men and that it is essential to educate the educator himself. This doctrine must, therefore, divide society into two parts, one of which is superior to society.
>
> The coincidence of the changing of circumstances and of human activity or self-changing can be conceived and rationally understood only as *revolutionary practice*.
>
> **Point 4**: Feuerbach starts out from the fact of religious self-alienation, of the duplication of the world into a religious world and a secular one. His work consists in resolving the religious world into its secular basis.
>
> But that the secular basis detaches itself from itself and establishes itself as an independent realm in the clouds can only be explained by the cleavages and self-contradictions within this secular basis. The latter must, therefore, in itself be both understood in its contradiction and revolutionized in practice. Thus, for instance, after the earthly family is discovered to be the secret of the holy family, the former must then itself be destroyed in theory and in practice.
>
> **Point 7**: Feuerbach, consequently, does not see that the "religious sentiment" is itself a social product, and that the abstract individual whom he analyses belongs to a particular form of society.

We should discuss a little about the meaning of point 7: The form of a religion, however noble the religion may be, will be in agreement with 'the Nature of the labour relations' prevailing in the society; according to the Nature whether there exists 'equality' or 'exploitation of labour'. If the relations involve of Masters and Slaves, princes and paupers, and prosperity and poverty, how can 'the religion of love' be effectual

between them? What kind of a human being is 'the human being'? Is that human being a 'king' or a 'Servant'? They both may appear alike physically. But, are their lives alike? We cannot consider all the human beings as similar and refer to them all as 'the human beings.' The human being must be understood differently. When referring to a human being, we must define the relations in which that human being exists in the society and in what condition. Is he an independent farmer, a tenant, a landlord, a craftsman, a trader, a laborer, or the one who does not do labour, a Master or a Labourer – thus, in reality, we must consider the social condition of the person. Ignoring the social conditions of the person, and referring to him as a 'human being' would only make him an imaginary human being, but not a real human being. This is the meaning of Marx in point 7.

Point 11: "The Philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways; the point, however, is to change it."

Was Feuerbach aware of the Marx's comments? Did he read his comments? Did he respond to Marx? – We do not have these details.

Engels said that in 'The Holy Family,' we can see how much Bach influenced Marx. Let us look at this book a little. ★

12. The history of 'The Holy Family'

There are nine chapters in this book. Marx wrote most of these chapters and Engels a few chapters. Engels wrote the foreword. The time of the writing was 1844. The book appeared for the first time in February 1845 in German. The book did not appear in English during the lifetime of either of the writers. The book first appeared in English in 1956. (This book was included in volume 4 of Marx and Engels collected works, Moscow edition, 1975.)

Feuerbach was not the inspiration for 'The Holy Family.' The real inspiration was the book '*A critical critique*' by a

liberal Christian missionary called Bruno Bauer, who wrote the book in an attempt to reform the Christian religion.

Bruno Bauer was a friend of Marx and Engels in the group of young Hegelians. However, Marx and Engels did not like his attempts of religious reforms. Marx and Engels wanted to make it clear that the insignificant religious reforms cannot solve the profound and basic issues of the society. They wrote 'The Holy Family' in response to the writing of Bruno Bauer's group The influence of Feuerbach on this critique was evident. The original name of the book was '*Critique of Critical Criticism*!' The other name of the book is 'The Holy Family.'

In the Christian religious stories, the three characters, namely, 'Jesus, Mary and Joseph' are referred to as 'The Holy Family. According to the stories, Mary gave birth to Jesus when she was not yet married. Joseph was the foster father of Jesus.

Marx and Engels gave the name 'The Holy Family' to Bauer and his group who attempted to reform the Christian religion. Although the Bauer and his group were friends of Marx and Engels, in the polemics on the religious matters, Marx and Engels were not liberal towards Bauer and leveled an intense critique against him. These arguments followed many rounds of debates between the two camps.

There were many reviews and criticisms written in support of 'The Holy Family' and also opposing the work.

A favorable review: One paper noted that it expressed socialist views since it criticized the "inadequacy of any half-measures directed at eliminating the social ailments of our time".

A negative review: Another paper wrote that, in The Holy, "every line preaches revolt… against the State, Church, the family, legality, religion and property"… "Prominence is given to the most radical and the most open Communism, and this is all the more dangerous as Mr. Marx cannot be denied either extremely broad knowledge or the ability to make use of the polemical arsenal of Hegel's logic, what is customarily called 'Iron Logic'."

'This book lays a foundation

for the development of scientific, Materialist, and revolutionary socialism,' said Lenin.

Although Engels contributed to a few parts, Marx wrote most of 'The Holy Family.' Engels, therefore, called it 'Marx's book'. He did not include himself as a co-author.

'One must read 'The Holy Family' in order to understand how much Feuerbach influenced Marx.' This statement can mean that Marx wrote the book after reading Feuerbach and the book is on Feuerbach. Marx did not write 'The Holy Family' in response to Feuerbach's writings. In fact, Marx prepared his critique in 1844 targeting the Bauer and company in the light of the Materialist knowledge learned from Feuerbach. This is the connection between Marx studying Feuerbach and writing 'The Holy Family.' ★

13. Dialectical Materialism

"What Is This World? Who made the Sun, Moon and Stars? How Did All These Come About?"

Ages ago, there were only speculations about these questions. These speculations made their "creator". In those days natural science did not make entry into the scene.

Before humans emerged, there were different types of animals. For them, there was only searching for food, but no intellect to ask "What is this world?" That is why they did not have a creator. Creator was made only after humans emerged from apes. "This universe is the creation of the creator. It somehow came into existence. It will disappear at the time of the final destruction of the world." - This was the speculation of the ancient humans.

Gradually a second speculation emerged, "This is Nature. There is no creator to it!"

From then till now, these two speculations have been continuing as two contradicting philosophies, contradicting isms. Those were the only meanings to these terms 'Idealism, Materialism' in the beginning. Just that much. Gradually, more details, more questions, were added.

Not just these philosophical speculations, but also natural

sciences have been developing. There is no place for creator in any natural science. Creator's role does not appear in any science. Still, it is not that the scientists have not given up the creator. They are scientists only by profession. They are mere ancient humans once they get up off the chairs at their work places! They will not touch machinery at work place without praying. There won't be a scientist's home without an idol of *Vinayaka*. These intellectuals recognize the need of science only for the sake of producing commodities.

Same is the case with Philosophers. They become great intellectuals even though they have not given up their belief in supernatural powers. We will again meet Hegel, the Philosopher, who did not give up the idea of the universal spirit.

Materialism is the only way to understand Nature and society, with proper knowledge. 'Dialectics' is the way to understand that Materialism properly.

There are some laws analyzing Nature's behavior. Even if we do not know those laws, Nature keeps doing its work. It will go on following its laws. 'Dialectics' is the name of those laws. Those laws are laws of dialectics. However with reference to society, among these laws, there are relevant laws to learn. And there are irrelevant laws that have been considered as great laws. If Nature is understood with relevant laws, it amounts to understanding Nature "dialectically". If we understand not only Nature but also society, and every context and every event properly, it amounts to understanding "dialectically".

In fact, logic involves arguments and counter arguments. It will be logic only when there is an opinion to contradict another opinion. If there is no contradicting opinion it will not be logic at all. But, just being contradictory will not make those opinions as logic. Those debates ought to follow certain laws, and proceed accordingly.

The laws of dialectics that debates should follow have been there in times before Christ, since Socrates. A methodology was formed, during the time of Socrates itself, on how debates should proceed. In the method of 'Argument - its counter argument -

result at the end'.

"No matter remains stable. It keeps changing." is an attribute of matter that should be understood. At the beginn-ing, we have read that this was told by people like Heraclitus and Democritus. However they did not talk about it with much clarity. However good a thing is, people who first found it, will not be able to talk about it with all the details. Based on what was originally said, others will comprehend more details that are further needed.

Even though in the past also some people talked about the laws of dialectics to some extent, observers say that it was Hegel, the Philosopher who talked about it in greater detail. But Materialists criticize him stating that by changing names of creator as 'universal spirit' and 'absolute idea', he relates all what he said to that 'idea'. Marx and Engels too have the same criticism on Hegel. However, Marx and Engels were of the view that what Hegel had perceived and stated were very relevant laws and that once these laws are added to Materialism, the Materialism that was with limited wisdom will develop into Materialism with perfect wisdom.

"Nature is primary. Human consciousness that arises because of that, is secondary" - this understanding constitutes Materialism. But, it is not Materialism in its entirety. More aspects need to be added to this ism. "Matter will have motion. All aspects of Nature are interconnected. Humans are also part of Nature." - All these properties are properties of matter. All the logic related to properties of matter is "dialectics". There will be some more laws.

If a person merely holds the view that, "There is no creator. That is not rational", that person is only an atheist. But, if he has the knowledge of all properties of matter, and has accepted them, then that person is a 'Materialist'. Atheism and dialectics together constitute proper Materialism. Which means, it is an enlightened Materialism.

When Materialism includes laws of dialectics that becomes 'dialectical Materialism'. That big name sounds too grandiose, but it simply means, 'proper logic'. If observed with this logic, it will give proper observational wisdom.

Hegel has written several

books. Many things are discussed in those books. Among those who wrote articles about Hegel's writings, there are those who retold what Hegel had stated; there are those who only talked about 'laws of dialectics'.

'Laws of logic that Hegel had stated are very accurate', this is the strong opinion that Marx and Engels have. Marx never wrote any book on 'Dialectics'. But, in 'Capital', there are few instances where he has conducted logic according to laws of dialectics. There are references of it in some letters. In the case of Engels, in a collection of his articles titled, "Dialectics of Nature", there are instances where he tried to examine Nature with laws of dialectics. After this, it is necessary to look into laws of dialectics that Hegel has stated. ★

14. Laws of Dialectics

"**Dialectics**" is the 4th chapter in the book, "**Dialectics of Nature**" that Engels had written. It begins with laws of dialectics. (I will give the next few sentences and paragraphs with minor changes and by reducing the number of words. They will not be understood if given verbatim. And I will again have to give meanings to them.)

Engels had shown three Laws of Dialectics.

First one: Transformation of Quantity into Quality. Likewise, Quality transforms into Quantity.

Second one: Opposites (Contradictions). Both conflicts and unity will be there in them.

Third one: Negation of the negation.

> Engels: "All three are developed by Hegel in Idealist fashion as mere laws of thought." (page-62, Dialectics of Nature. Calcutta: National Book Agency, 1993)

In those laws, second one should come first. That is the law of 'Contradictions'. Contradictions are actually the main cause for motion and changes in matter. So, law of contradictions should be considered as first law. But Hegel did not say it in this order. Hegel, did not say the things that he said in the form laws. In his book '**Logic**', he said these three types of elements as his observations. Engels, who read **Logic**, briefly summarized

Hegel's observations as 3 laws in his book **Dialectics of Nature**. It was Hegel, who put those things in that order. Engels article was not published when Engels was alive. It was printed only later. Even though I felt that among the three laws, second one should be put in place of first one, I did not make that change. I left that order as it was.

We shall see later the details of what these 3 laws say. He presented these laws as 'Laws of Thought'! Hegel presented these laws in the book titled '**Logic**'. These laws are fundamental to Hegel's theory. Engels, however, criticized in his essay Dialectics that Hegel presented these Laws in an 'Idealist fashion as mere laws of thought'.

Hegel showed few examples in Nature - to show that the laws of Thought operate in Nature as well. Engels found it wrong to state them that way. Engels criticism is that, laws of Nature should be understood by observing Nature; laws of society by observing society, but it is wrong to assume that laws of Thought are applicable to both Nature as well as society .

> Engels: "The general Nature of dialectics to be developed as the science of inter-connections, in contrast to metaphysics. It is, therefore from the history of Nature and human society that the laws of dialectics are abstracted" (page-62).

Since Hegel did not obtain the laws as they should have been, Engels says as follows:

> "The mistake lies in the fact that these laws are foisted on Nature and history as laws of thought, and not deduced from them. This is the source of the whole forced and often outrageous treatment; the universe, willy-nilly, has to conform to a system of thought which itself is only the product of a definite stage of evolution of human thought" (page-62)

Look at the last sentence again. What does 'willy-nilly' mean? Willingly or unwillingly. Whose willingness (liking) or unwillingness (not liking)? By universe or humans? In fact whose words are these? Hegel's or Engels'? Using those words, Engels himself says, Hegel's argument is "outrageous". Willingness or unwillingness could be for anyone, for humans or for universe also. Engels' words mean: "Even if anyone likes it or

not, universe has to conform to a system of Thought - Look how outrageous Hegel's argument is.'

Does Hegel mean that universe has to conform to human thoughts! Should the universe that was created by the universal spirit, by the absolute idea conform to the frame of human thoughts! Moreover, if it is unwilling (likes it or not)! Perhaps it is this 'outrageous' view that Feuerbach had criticized in the past! Not only Feuerbach's criticism, there is criticism of Hegel even in Engel's statements. Didn't Engels criticize Hegel's view as a 'mistake' and 'outrageous'?

> Engels also says, "If we turn the thing round, then everything becomes simple, and the dialectical laws that look so extremely mysterious in Idealist Philosophy at once become simple and clear as noonday"

Engels says that Hegel's argument is erroneous and that it should be turned straight.

What is the mistake in Hegel's argument? How to turn it upside down?

It appears that Hegel's argument implies that the universe has to conform to a system of human thought. Does Hegel imply the same? Alas, are we understanding him correctly? I still have doubts about this. Because would anybody, that too, a person who is at least a bit of an intellectual say that universe has to conform to a system of human thought! But Engels says that Hegel means just that, doesn't he? Engels did say it, but still I am unable to believe it. Would someone, who worships the universe, say that the universe must conform to human thought? Would a devotee say that god himself must conform to human thought? He won't, will he? So, did Hegel mean something else when he said that universe has to conform to human thought? Was Hegel saying that everything about universe should come into the thoughts of humans; that all the universe should be attainable into human thought and thus man should comprehend the universe in its entirety? If he had said like this then it will be correct. May be he was saying so and may be we are not understanding him. This is my doubt.

But, if that was Hegel's

intended meaning, then why would there be criticism on that? Neither Feuerbach nor Marx or Engels, who made these criticisms were irres-ponsible people. Not any less intelligent people. They are people who read all the original books written by Hegel. They had examined many aspects of those books. Moreover, as Hegelians, they liked Hegel. If such people made criticism about Hegel's arguments, wouldn't there be factual reasons for it? So Hegel's argument must have been wrong. If I reason out this way, it seems my doubt is resolved. But it doesn't resolve. How could a worshipper of universal spirit say that the Universe has to conform to man's thoughts. This question keeps frustrating again and again.

Actually, this matter must be looked into in such great detail because this is an important occasion to understand Idealism and Materialism. It is on this occasion that Marx and Engels made an important criticism of Hegel. That is why it is very essential.

Mistake in Hegel's argument: It is a mistake all Idealists make. An Idealist considers idea (thought) as primary, and universe (Nature) as a secondary, doesn't he? Hegel did the same thing. According to him, the laws that he stated were product of his thought. Hegel suggests that those laws apply to Nature as well. In fact, for any idea, Nature is the basis. Those laws are part of Nature's conduct. Ideas are in accordance with Nature. Appropriate way is to state these laws as primarily laws of Nature, and then can be stated as laws of ideas. But what did Hegel do? He stated those laws primarily as laws of Thought, and then gave examples related to Nature as well. Exactly, in opposite sense. It amounts to saying that Nature's conduct will be in accordance with man's ideas". This is where Hegel made a mistake.

Then, how to straighten Hegel's erroneous argument? Hegel stated that universe has to conform to human thought, didn't he? If we change Hegel's view and say that 'human Thought should conform to the universe', then it amounts to turning Hegel's argument upside down. To change that

way, human thought should be in such a way to comprehend what kind of laws are there in Nature. After that, human behavior (actions) should be in accordance with those laws. If Nature is understood this way, it amounts to setting Hegel's argument right.

Earth has gravitational power. Humans should first comprehend that property of Nature. Should understand it correctly. Human behavior should be in accordance with it. While walking on the ground, if leg slips we will fall down. Earth has the property to pull. It will pull. We will break our back. If we have this thought and walk carefully, it means that we understood the properties of the earth and conforms to it. If the human being is careful, without falling down, it is neither victory to Nature nor failure of the human being. Human being is also part of Nature. It simply means that human being who is part of Nature will be in accordance with the gravitation power of the earth, which is another aspect of Nature. Humans conforming to the gravitational power of the earth is akin to the fact that the tongue in man's mouth takes care of itself by not falling between the teeth.

Instead of saying, universe has to conform to the frame of Human Thought, if it is said that Human Thought should conform to the laws of the universe, it indicates setting right Hegel's argument that was upside down. This is what Marx and Engels said.

The upside down argument that any Idealist states should be set right. It is good to set right Hegel's arguments, but I also have a doubt on those laws that Hegel had stated! According to Engels, how did Hegel comprehend those Laws? Engels clearly wrote that Hegel's 'mistake lies in the fact that these laws are foisted on Nature and history as laws of thought, and not deduced from them.'(page-62). That means the laws that Hegel stated were not arrived at by observing Nature. These were imposed on Nature by saying that these indeed are laws of Nature and Nature behaves according to these laws. Just because such laws are added to Materialism, would they become laws of Nature? If aspects that were not

obtained from Nature were described as something found in Nature as well, would these laws of Nature truly become properties of Nature? In fact, why should the laws that were not obtained from Nature be recognized as laws of Nature? Would they become laws of Nature if we say, "Let us recognize that way."?

But, in his article, Engels considered that these are appropriate Laws. Because, Engels states that Hegel had shown several examples of the dialectical laws from Nature and history. Engels statement means that Hegel had shown proofs that dialectical laws are found in Nature and in society.

> Engels: "Moreover, anyone who is even only slightly acquainted with Hegel will be aware that in hundreds of passages Hegel is capable of giving the most striking individual illustrations of the dialectical laws from Nature and history." (page-63).

"Striking illustrations" mean examples that absolutely prove the subject that was stated.

To the question, 'How can laws of Thought become laws of Nature?', Engels' answer will be: The laws of Thought that Hegel had stated are indeed laws of Dialectics and hence those laws apply to any sector, and to any aspect in that.

About these laws, Engels initially said, "...the dialectical laws that look so extremely mysterious…" That means, they are incomprehensible but they are indeed 'laws of dialectics'. Hence they are 'appropriate laws'. And that they should be included in Materialism.

> Engels: "If we turn the thing round, then everything becomes simple, and the dialectical laws that look so extremely mysterious in Idealist Philosophy at once become simple and clear as noonday…the dialectical laws are real laws of development of Nature, and therefore are valid also for theoretical natural science." (pages:62-63).

This is to say - since the laws of Thought which Hegel had stated are indeed laws of dialectics, they are related to any type of science.

Either Hegel or other essayists who wrote on Hegel show the three laws and simply say that these are laws of Thought, but nowhere do we

find any explanation as to how they operate.

The argument that revolves around 'universal spirit' is an utterly worthless argument. Yet if a man (who believes in the universal spirit) finds few good words because of some intelligent thought, and if those are truly good words, those words must be grasped and used. Marx and Engels thought the same.

Since Engels said that laws which Hegel stated apply to Nature as well as society, we should begin to see what these laws are about.

★

15. Hegel's First Law of Dialectics: Change in Quality with Change in Quantity

In the previous chapter, we have mentioned Hegel's discovery in the form of three Laws. But, the essence of these three laws is the same. We will know this only after examining into these three laws. While examining one law, it might be necessary to mention the three laws as well.

Even though vaguely, it appears in articles written about dialectics, that the word 'Dialectics' and it's laws, had been there, since before Christ.

Laws of dialectics are nothing but laws relating to matter. Those laws may be obtained sometimes from natural sciences and sometimes from logical thinking by Philosophers.

From the people who have read Hegel's writings and written articles on them, we see that they only mean to say "Hegel is of this opinion." It appears in those articles that it was hard for writers of those articles, to understand Hegel's language. While writing about Feuerbach, didn't Engels say that Hegel's writing style is "abstruse" (=difficult to understand)?

Marx and Engels had praised Hegel, for naming the new laws of dialectics. Those words of praise were given only to the laws he discovered and

not to the 'universal soul' that he mentioned.

We have already seen in the previous chapter the 3 laws which Hegel discovered. We should now examine them one after the other in detail.

1. The Law of Transformation of quantity into quality and quality into quantity:

What is it that transforms? Matter. Nature is full of matter. It has several forms. Air and water, trees and mountains, animals and humans - everything. From sand pebble to the sun, everything is matter. Even earlier Philosophers had said that matter keeps changing. But only Hegel said in how many ways those changes can happen and consequences of those changes. Mechanical changes, changes in form, chemical changes, in this way there will be changes in the property (quality) of that matter at some stage. However, Engels also said that Hegel did not give these details with clarity and that he was assuming those details.

(To be frank that at some places I am also trying to explain in great detail by adding my own *poetic-madness* to the evidence found in the essays on dialectics in order to make readers understand.)

We have seen in the beginning itself, that water in the river will keep moving without being stagnant in one place. If there is only change in place, it is a mechanical change. Air also keeps moving places without staying in one place. Also, when earth is revolving around the sun and is rotating around itself, wherever sun's rays fall on earth it becomes 'day' and wherever sun rays do not fall it becomes 'night'. The places where those rays fall keeps changing. Changes in night and day, come under mechanical changes. There will not be any change in properties of matter with such mechanical changes.

To see 'change in property', it should be seen in a different way. There are small raw, tender mangoes on a mango tree. Let us observe one tender mango. Let us assume it has some property (quality) and some size (quantity). The tender mango is very small. If eaten, it will be tangy or tastes astringent. It is not good to eat either. As the days pass by,

tender mangoes grow very big. They change color. Slowly they ripen and fall off the tree. If those fruit are eaten, they are sweetest. How did the tender mango become fruit? There was a gradual change in the body of the tender mango. With growth in body of the tender mango, change in color, change in smell, change in taste, several changes happened. All within the body itself. This change is not a mechanical change. Since that fruit fell from the tree, it has definitely changed its place. But, change of place is not the only change that happened to this matter (substance). First, if we consider that tender mango had some size and some property, by the time it became a fruit, its quality has changed since many changes in its quantity took place.

But, what do we think when we see that fruit or while eating it? We think, "This fruit is so good!" Don't we know that tender mango grows into a fruit? We do. But, we do not think of that change in words like, "Its quality has changed due to change in its quantity." Hegel said those changes in those words, as a law. That is one of the changes that happen to the substance.

We already know that tender fruit changes into ripe fruit, don't we? What is the fresh advantage in describing the same change, in new words like 'quantity and quality'? The advantage is that our understanding with regard to changes will increase owing to our perception that change is the Law of Matter and that Law applies not only to one substance but all substances.

Instead of letting the fruit grow well on the tree itself, the traders pick them when they grow to a particular size, spray chemicals, smoke them, and brings changes to their size using some tricks to make half ripe fruit look like fully ripe fruit. This does not mean that the Philosopher who discovered the fact that Quality changes due to change in Quantity said so with a commercial mind. But, if that Law is known, it can be used in both, good and bad ways. Traders give injections to bottle gourds and watermelons and make them grow quickly. They sell them with more weight. Those who do so will secure more profit over and

above the cost of injections. People who eat those fruit may die. But that is not the seller's problem. (They too eat the same fruit. But they don't die so soon. They would have earned lot of money. They buy medical treatment.) They also give injections to cows and make the cow that usually gives 4 liters of milk to give 14 liters. Even if that cow dies in a short span of time, the seller will have made lot of profit by then. Later on he will find a new cow anyway. For profits to grow like this, isn't it by knowing how changes happen in sub-stances? 'Quantity-quality' law might be used for good results as well.

Let us see some more aspects of mango fruit. Will the fruit that ripened on the tree grow back into a tender mango again? That will not happen. Or, can we change it into a tender mango by means of some kind of science? Even that is not possible. Tender mango changed into a fruit but the ripe fruit will not change back into tender fruit. That means, the quality that changed into something new will not change back into old quality. This is the characteristic of Nature.

If we eat the ripened fruit or animals eat it that is the end of it. But if no one eats it and it remains under the tree, what will happen to it? It will rot after few days. Even that change happens because of the characteristics within the body of the fruit. The property, when it was a ripe fruit, goes away when it body rots, and a new property develops. At the end, that rotten fruit is absorbed into earth. When it was tender, it had one property. When ripened into a fruit, that property is another property. When it became rotten, it is the third property.

By 'quantity transforms into quality', we may understand transformation of tender fruit into a ripe fruit. Then what is, 'quality transforming into quantity'? Does it mean the ripe fruit grows back into a tender fruit? No, right? What changed into fruit will not change backward, it only changes forward. Rotting is the change forward. As this is the first example, we have seen this in such detail. Not everything requires so many details.

Caterpillar changes into butterfly. E.g. changes into a chick. Even these changes are

examples of law relating to 'quantity transforming quality'. Once caterpillar changes into butterfly, will that flying butterfly change into the earlier caterpillar? Can we change it back? - That will not happen. Once the egg turns into chick, will that chick turn back into egg? - Even this won't happen. When we speak of 'quantity changes into quality' and quality changes into quantity', it does not mean that a given matter that changed forward will change backwards. It will change forward until it perishes.

To explain the law of transformation of quantity into quality, Engels showed (in his article on dialectics) the example of water as one of the examples that Hegel had given.

> Engels: "Here every change is a transformation of quantity into quantity, a consequence of the quantitative change of the amount of motion of one form or another that is inherent in the body or communicated to it. "*Thus the temperature of water is, in the first place, a point of no consequence in respect to its liquidity; still with the increase or diminution of the temperature of liquid water, there comes a point where this state of cohesion alters and the water is converted into steam or ice."— Hegel. (Page- 65)*

Water can change back into ice and it can change forth into steam. Steam can change back again. Ice can change forth again. That way we can change water back and forth into 3 stages. Those stages can change from whichever way. These changes can be changes in form only, but how can they be changes in quality? Engels explained that, while in the form of water, its atoms are in one state, when water changes to ice those atoms come together tightly, or when water changes into steam those atoms disperse. When steam is put in a vase and changed into water, state of atoms changes back and it becomes water. Same way, if water is changed into ice, state of atoms changes even backwards. These are forms that change back and forth. These changes are changes in form only. Engels calls this 'change in form of quality and quantity'. When calling it a 'change of form' why use the word quality (property)? If water changes into steam can it be

understood as change in quality of that matter? If water changes into steam, is that also change in quality? Can this example of 'water', be used as an example for law of quantity and quality? Hegel might have given this example, but can Engels agree with it?

Did Hegel combine both types of changes, namely, changes in quality and changes in form, as 'changes in quantity and quality'? These details with such clarity are not found in any of the articles I have read.

It seems, if another atom adds up to 'oxygen', it will turn into 'ozone' gas! If that happens, because of change in quantity, it may be said that the old quality has changed to a new quality.

When I read about this law of quantity and quality, I remembered at once something that happens every day. When a drop of buttermilk is added to warm milk and set aside, doesn't it become 'curds'? If nothing changes in milk, would it become curds? Only because there was a change in the body of milk, its quality changed. But, will curds change back into milk? - That won't happen. Looking at the bowl of curds, we will think that "it fermented well", but we will not think that quantity has changed into quality. (From now on, we should think like that when we see curds!). Even though we do not consider it as a law, what happened there indeed was operation of that law. Similar is the instance of raw rice turning into cooked rice. Similarly, Brinjals changing into curry.

Clarification given by **Afanasyev**, writer of the book '*Marxist Philosophy*', regarding these 'quantity-quality' changes, is the good one. We read things such as 'some of the changes in properties of substances happen slowly, while some changes happen as fast as 'big leap'. But writers of articles do not give examples immediately. We will have to imagine based on whatever we know. Milk changing into curds happens slowly. If limestone is mixed with Turmeric water, it suddenly turns red. There are some more such examples. Even though Afanasyev does not give examples, his explanation regarding changes, is somewhat useful.

> "The basic feature of any leap is a radical turn in development or formation of a new quality....Some leaps are sudden and swift,....Other leaps are less rapid and not so sudden...Gradual quantitative changes do not affect the essence, the Nature of an object, whereas every leap, even a gradual one, is always a decisive turn in development, it transforms the object and turns it into a qualitatively new object." (page-103-4)

For example, egg changing into chick, seed turning into plant. For people who sell goods, this law of quantity-quality might be profitable, but what good is this law to others?

Irrespective of whether there is any good in it or not, this is to know about a law.

Various writers, who explained this law of 'quantity-quality', have given few examples in articles on dialectics, from the way people talk at home, with common sense. They say that women who cook food at their homes know this law very well. It seems every woman knows that if more salt is added to soup, quality of soup changes. If salt is more, or less, it indicates change in quantity. Because of that, there is change in the quality of soup. For cooks who do not know the danger that can happen with salt, it is better if they know the law of quantity and quality. They will be in their senses while putting salt while cooking.

Another Example: It seems there is a proverb somewhere, "*If one hair string falls off the head, would it become bald?*" This means: Would the quality of the head change with a slightest change in the volume of hair? Those people talk dialectically with "common sense." Another proverb, "*constant dropping wears away a stone*." This thought is also related to dialectics. Change in quantity of the stone could change the stone into sand.

"Would a sack fill up with one grain of rice?"- is another proverb. This means, if quantity of grains increases, only when that change occurs, there will be a change in the situation. This amounts to saying that with common sense everyone will know laws of matter.

Fascinated by what Hegel's Law of Quantity and Quality, Marx said that if the quantity of

money increases, it will turn into 'capital'"! Money, if it is in one corner in a box, it is not 'Capital'. If it is only one rupee or half rupee, it cannot function as 'capital'. If there is a minimum amount of rupees 10 and if it is lent out to someone, that can be used as Interest-bearing capital. This means that with change in quantity of money, quality of money has changed, isn't it?

Not only that, if capitalist wealth turns into socialist wealth, such a change falls under the law of quantity and quality. If observed like this, it so appears that all old qualities change into new qualities.

Without knowing the law of 'quantity and quality' Russian scientist **Mendeleyev** thought logically and assumed that there should be some elements that were not known at that time. After that a scientist named Lecoq found those elements. It mean that even without knowing Hegelian law, science experiments will continue in their way, isn't it?

Why did Marx and Engels like this law of quantity and quality? Is it because milk changes to curds? It is not because of such little changes. Before anyone else, they both alone knew that this is a society based on exploitation. They liked the law very much because this law of dialectics states that, if quantitative changes occur in the society, the character (quality) of the society would change and a new change would take place whereby relations of exploitation are eliminated.

A question arises regarding this law. Wasn't it said that Hegel considered this law (and the other two laws, which we will see later) as 'laws of Thought'? What do quantity and quality mean with regard to Thought? No one has clarified this point in any article. How to understand that there will be changes in Thought due to this law of quantity-quality? Let's say thoughts of a believer in god are in a certain way. If an intense change occurs in his thoughts and he becomes a Materialist, doesn't it mean that quality of his Thought has changed? Or, if an atheist turns into a believer, doesn't it mean there is change in quality of thought? Should it be under-stood like this? (There might be a frightening thought in Hegel that believers might also turn into Materialists.)

May be not in the aspect of

'belief', but does Hegel mean that several kinds of qualitative changes occur? Shouldn't the writers, who wrote on the theme of Laws of Thought, say what big changes happen in thoughts? They did not. Not sure if even Hegel said anything about these changes.

While talking about this law of quality – quantity, Engels said that it operates in all fields. \

> "In biology, as in the history of human society, the same law holds good at every step..." (page-68).

In Biology, we have seen caterpillar changing into a butterfly and an egg changing into a chick. But, I have doubts when it is said that this law operates in the history of human society at every stage. We will get more clarity only after seeing the other two laws.

After this law of quality - quantity, we should look into Hegel's Law of the inter-penetration of opposites (contradictions). But before looking into that we should know something about the concept of 'contradictions'. Only if we have little bit of understanding, we will be able to understand and discuss it. So, we will talk about 'contradictions' in the next chapter based on our understanding. In a subsequent chapter, we will see Hegel's second law. ★

16. On 'Contradictions'

'The Law of Interpenetration of Opposites' is the second law that Hegel had talked about. Before looking into that law, we should first know a little bit about 'opposites.'

'Opposite' means contradiction. When two situations, or two relationships, contradict each other, then they are opposites.

Look at these word pairs:

Day versus night, cold versus hot, sunshine versus rain, light versus dark, yesterday versus today, today versus tomorrow, black versus white, woman versus man, tiger versus goat, birth versus death. Both parts in such pairs are opposite of each other. But, these opposites are inherent in Nature. These opposites will always be there, and should always be there.

Because the Earth revolves around itself while revolving

around the Sun, day and night occur. Seasons happen. Cold and hot, sunshine and rain, all these happen. Among these opposites in Nature, there will never be a situation where only one remains and the other extincts. In 'day versus night' pair, it will never happen so that only day remains without the night or only night remains without the day. For that to happen, Earth should stop revolving. That will never happen because Earth does not stop revolving. That means 'day and night' are opposites. They will not vanish themselves nor humans can eliminate them. Not only these few opposites; any opposition in Nature will originate according to laws of matter, and will remain to be something that continues forever. Hence, it is not possible to eliminate the opposites in Nature.

Look at another type of opposites!

Wealth versus poverty, king versus pauper, servitude versus mastership, wrong versus right, hardship versus prosperity, this caste versus that caste, this religion versus that religion — what are these opposites? These are not like opposites that are in Nature. These do not originate naturally. These are unnatural opposites that formed due to 'unnaturalness' in a society, where humans live, and are continuing. Unnaturalness in human relations is '**Exploitation of Labor**.' It is because of that unnaturalness, unnatural opposites like 'mastership versus servitude' had begun among humans. All the opposites that occur in every field and in every aspect are the result of exploitation of labour. Since these are not natural as the opposites in Nature, it is possible to eliminate them. All these opposites will perish if their unnatural cause is removed. These opposites should be eliminated as they do not vanish themselves.

We should know how opposites, 'mastership versus servitude' emerge because of 'Exploitation of Labor'. When there is a person who does not do labor (does not work), there should be another person who does all the labor for that person. A person, who does not work, should live by other people's labor. How does a person get other people's labor? He would get only due to

antagonistic opposites based on exploitation of labour. If everyone works, it will not be necessary for anyone to live by exploiting others' labor. There will not be a 'servant' where there is no 'master'. There will not be a master where there are no servants. For these opposites to vanish, the causes behind those opposites should vanish. That means, 'Exploitation of Labor' should vanish. If that vanishes, those two people will become equals. They will be fellow humans without a master versus servant relation.

Any opposite that is not 'natural' is 'unnatural'. But not every opposite that occur in societies based on exploitation is an antagonistic opposite. There will be many 'Non-antagonistic opposites' as well, in the same society. There will be opposites among two masters who get same commodities made and earn 'profits'. But, these are Non-antagonistic opposites. There will be opposites among employees, who work for the same employer, who do physical labor and employees who do intellectual labor. These too are Non-antagonistic opposites. But, if they are between a master and servants, then they will always be antagonistic opposites.

Let there be any kind of opposites (contradictions), namely, 'antagonistic' and 'non-antagonistic' opposites in a society, the reason for such contradiction is the fact that the society is based on exploitation of labour. It is not necessary for us to dwell upon this issue of 'antagonistic' and versus 'Non-antagonistic' opposites. Our focus should be only on antagonistic opposites.

But we should remind ourselves once again about opposites in Nature. Will there be antagonistic versus Non-antagonistic distinction between opposites in Nature also? Let us see the same. In the 'day versus night' pair, it is clear to us that there is no antagonistic opposition between these two aspects and that it is a natural opposition. But because there is no antagonistic opposition in this pair of words, does it mean that there is a Non-antagonistic opposition? 'Antagonism and Non-antagonism' are aspects related to only humans. These are situations that form only in human relations. This antagonistic

versus Non-antagonistic distinction does not apply to any aspect in Nature. The opposition between 'day' and 'night' is neither antagonistic nor Non-antagonistic. It is only 'natural'. That's all! It is a natural relation! The opposition between 'sunshine' and 'rain' is also neither antagonistic nor Non-antagonistic. That is completely natural as well. Similarly, any opposition between any aspects within Nature is all natural.

Then, in Nature, what is the opposition between 'tiger versus goat'? Is it not antagonistic? It is not. Anything which is not antagonism, is Non-antagonism, isn't it? No it is not. There is a particular character that is neither of them. Wherever that character is there, it is natural. Among the opposites in Nature, tiger versus goat opposition is as natural as day versus night opposition. Without human intervention, whatever happens between animals in a forest is normal to Nature. But when humans, in order to earn money, catch tigers and put them in cages, make them do feats in circus, feed them by killing goats or push goats into their cages, the tiger versus goat opposition in such situation is not natural like what happens in a forest. It is vileness in humans!

Killing of animals by human beings in primitive times for food is similar to tiger versus goat naturalness. But if civilized human beings too do the same thing with animals, it will not be natural. Nor will it be antagonistic opposition. Antagonism versus Non-antagonism exists only when there are humans on both sides. They are characteristics of human relations only. Relations between humans and animals do not fall under the category of antagonism versus Non-antagonism at any time. In civilized times, the feeling that humans have towards animals is either compassion or cruelty! Any one of these two! Domination of animals by civilized humans amounts to cruelty. Cruelty of humans towards animals that are not equal to humans is a lowly act that does not comply with human refinement.

In the name of love towards birds and animals, not letting them stay in their natural habitat, destroying their freedom, putting them in cages, torturing them lifelong, is more vile than killing

them for food!

If human pair 'female and male' is considered, this pair will also have normalcy of Nature, as well as unnatural-ness formed in society. When this 'female and male' pair is considered as something natural, male versus female opposition (difference in bodies) is natural. If this pair is considered as a pair in the society based on exploitation, the opposition in this pair (difference in social situation) is unnatural! In exploitative societies, if antagonistic contradictions arise in the male versus female pair to the extent of committing murders, it will not be normal to Nature. Those are results of faulty conditions that exist in that society!

So far, we have briefly seen opposites that are normal to Nature such as 'day versus night' and unnatural opposites such as 'servitude versus mastership' that exist in an exploitative society. From now on our focus should be only on society and not on Nature. The society in which humans have been living since generations is the society consisting of exploitative social relations. Hence, people should examine contradictions that arise in relations in a society.

Let us consider the pair, 'wealth versus poverty'. Wealth accumulates at a person who exploits other people's labor. Poverty increases at a person whose labor is exploited. If there are no relations of exploitation of labor, the conditions of 'wealth versus poverty' will disappear and those words will also become obsolete in the language. It will never happen that 'poverty' remains while 'wealth' is gone or 'wealth' remains while 'poverty' is gone. In pairs of Antagonist versus Non-antago-nistic contradictions between humans, when one aspect goes away the other too goes away.

Look at the pair, 'good versus bad'! This is not opposition in Nature. It is an opposition that arises in a society. 'Good versus bad' pair is connected with the society. In Nature, good and bad, right and wrong do not exist. Everything that happens in Nature, every relation among aspects of Nature, are all natural. Hence good and bad, right and wrong should be considered as

oppositions in an exploitative society. In order to eliminate these opposites (contradictions), there is no other solution than eliminating the underlying reason that caused them, and turn the social relations towards a path free from contradictions. Opposites, not amenable to reform or unity ought to be eliminated completely.

We should look more into the good versus bad pair. When old bad goes away, old good will also go away. This is how it happens: in the times when there was inequality between man and woman, if a young man marries a young woman whom he liked, disregarding caste differences and without expecting dowry, it was a brave deed, a great ideal and a great refinement for those times. But let us say the old society has changed and those inequalities do not exist anymore, and there is nothing 'bad' in the society. When there is no bad, would all that exists become 'good'? It won't. When one word, within a pair of opposites goes away then doesn't it mean the other word goes away as well? In order to call a situation 'good', there should be 'bad' in that society. The thing that is not 'bad' is 'good.' When there is no bad, old meaning for good goes away and then the word itself goes away. In a society where there are relations of equality between men and women, when a young man marries a young woman, without taking dowry, would that become 'ideal'? Would that be greater good? All those adjectives belong to the old society. The thing that was 'good' in the old society, becomes normal in a society that has no opposites. Only when there is an opposite, there will be pair of words for that opposition. When the opposition goes away, those two words will go away as well. When there is no 'wrong', 'right' will not be there with the name 'right'. It will become a natural state. It will then be natural.

Where there is no 'hardship', comfort is a natural state. Happiness when there is no 'sorrow', is a natural state. Natural state is not bravery, not sacred, not ideal. It is natural to that society. It is normal.

In a society without exploitation, errors do occur in the making of products. But they are not errors in human relations.

So far, we have seen natural opposites and societal opposites. The opposites in Nature are natural. Hence it is not possible to eliminate them. Day versus night, sunshine versus rain, will never vanish. The things that can be removed and that should be removed are the unnatural opposites in the society. In the pairs: wealth versus poverty and this religion versus that religion, if one part is eliminated, the other part too will be eliminated.

We should first have at least this much understanding about 'opposites' (about contradictions). 'Antagonism' does not apply to relations in Nature. It applies only to human relations. Even that happens in relations where there is exploitation.

One aspect about 'opposites' should always be remembered. Opposites in Nature are natural and permanent! Opposites in society are unnatural and are temporary!

If antagonistic opposites are still visible in a society that gained reputation as 'good society', then it means the society has not changed yet! ★

17. Hegel's 2nd Law of Dialectics : Unity and Contradiction of Opposites

The meaning of Hegel's law of 'opposites (contradictions)' is as follows: Mutual opposition is present in any and every kind of matter. Both contradictions and unity coexist in those opposites. Motion occurs in that matter only because of these opposites. Because of that motion, depending on the character of that matter, change occurs in the quantity of the matter, in whichever way it is possible to happen, and thereby a new quality will occur in that matter.' – Thus both law of 'quantity - quality' and law of 'opposites' co-exist in Hegel's dialectics.

We should remember one thing when it is said that "there will be motion in any and every matter". Considering human body, there will be hundreds of movements in that body. Air keeps going in and out of the

body. Blood keeps flowing, constantly, through the blood vessels. Heart keeps beating. Eyelids keep moving. Fluids keep oozing from glands. Food keeps going in and coming out - aren't all these movements? Hegel need not tell anything new about all these in the name of 'motion', but he had elaborated something more.

The 'opposites' that appear in articles like "Dialectics", and "Basic Forms of Motion" that Engels had written about Hegel's laws, are oppositions that exist only in Nature. Natural - Unnatural distinctions are not found in what Hegel had said (as essayists on Hegel described) about 'opposites'. All the opposites appear to be only Natural.

We should look into the examples that Engels had given concerning the naturalness (the normalcy) of those laws.

> Engels: "In these series we encounter the Hegelian law in yet another form. The lower members permit only of a single mutual arrangement of the atoms. If, however, the number of atoms united into a molecule attains a size definitely fixed for each series, the grouping of the atoms in the molecule can take place in more than one way: so that two or more isomeric substances can be formed, having equal numbers of Carbon, Hydrogen, and Oxygen atoms in the molecule but nevertheless quantitatively distinct from one another. We can even calculate how many such isomers are possible for each member of the series." (page-67)

Natural scientists already knew what these words mean.

> Engels: "…the Hegelian law is valid not only for compound substances but also for the chemical eliments themselves. We know that 'the chemical properties of the eliments are a periodic function of their atomic weights' (page 67).

One question arises - If something is already known before Hegel's law came about, then what new things are learnt because of Hegel's law?

Even if what Hegel had stated is not new, it is possible to understand previously unknown things, since he presented things that happen by way of certain laws. It is, indeed, a good effort if the laws that were stated are accurate. We should

examine if those laws are accurate or not.

In the example where milk turns to curds, we will not be able to see the 'opposition' that exists there, but we may observe that the property of milk changes and a new property are acquired. When that change happens, it implies that some opposition emerged when milk and drop of buttermilk are mixed together. Only when it is known that there is a law of opposites, will it be understood that those oppositions worked in the case of example of curds. If that law is not known, the reason behind milk turning into curds will not be known. It is indeed necessary to state laws about things that happen, if those laws are accurate.

Whatever is supposed to happen will happen even if we are not aware of the laws. Law is based on what happens and things do not happen based on law.

> Engels: "By means of the—unconscious-application of Hegel's law of the trans-formation of quantity into quality, Mendeleyev achieved a scientific feat.." (Needless to mention that all these quotes are from Dialectics of Nature.)

This means, it is evident that it is possible to know new things from natural sciences without reference to Hegel's laws. Attempts will not stop even when laws are not known. However, knowing the laws will help more in certain situations.

Only things relating to Nature appear in examples given by Engels. Those are the examples that help us under-stand that for the poles that are on top and bottom of the earth, one has attraction and the other has repulsion, and that they will always have equal force, and that because these opposite forces are equal, the earth stands as it does.

> Engels: "Descartes' principle that the amount of motion present in the universe is always the same, has only the formal defect of applying a finite expression to an infinite magnitude." (page-70)
>
> "…the basic form of all motion is approximation and separation, contraction and expansion—in short, the old polar opposites of **attraction** and **repulsion**." (page-71)

These are examples that show how natural the opposites in Nature are, how stable they

are, and how necessary they are. What will be evident from such examples is that the fact that opposites that exist in Nature are not those that stop, and that they are not like opposites that exist in society. Any opposition that exists in society (in human relations) should be eliminated wherever it exists. These are the ones that get eliminated if we eliminate them. This means oppositions in Nature are not same as oppositions in society. Hence, it is not possible to say that "laws of opposites in Nature will apply verbatim to society as well." By "opposites", it should not be considered that all opposites are of the same kind. See some more! If there are natural opposites in the Nature motion itself ceases and Nature itself will remain as it was.

> Engels: "All motion consists in the interplay of attraction and repulsion. Motion, however, is only possible when each individual attraction is compensated by a corresponding repulsion somewhere else. Otherwise in time one side would get the preponderance over the other and then motion would finally cease. Hence all attractions and all repulsions in the universe must mutually balance one another. Thus the law of the indestructibility and uncreatability of motion is expressed in the form that each movement of attraction in the universe must have as its complement an equivalent movement of repulsion and vice versa….." (page-71)

"Vice versa" means, repulsion equaling attraction, attraction equaling repulsion! "*the sum of all attractions in the universe is equal to sum of all repulsions.*" (page-72)

"*…the separation and opposition of these poles exit only within their mutual connection and union……" "…no question of a final cancelling out of repulsion and attraction…"* What an enlightened explana-tion it is! *"…no question of a final cancelling out of repulsion and attraction…"* What does this sentence say? It says that natural opposites which are necessary for the Nature to continue will not get cancelled. Look at this sentence:

"…the law of the indestructibility and uncreatability of motion is expressed….." (page-71).

This means that no one creates motion.

Sun has attraction. Earth too has attraction. Earth gets attracted to the Sun. But it will stop, wherever its force makes it possible, from colliding with the Sun. If we see from the side of Sun, earth's attraction is opposite to Sun's own attraction. Similarly if we see from the side of Earth, Sun's attraction is opposite to earth's own attraction. When Sun tries to pull the Earth, Earth tries to pull the Sun. The Sun and the Earth have harmony in attraction and repulsion. Same is the case with the Earth and the Moon. There is no question of one of the aspects in natural opposites getting canceled. It is not Nature if that happens.

But, are the opposites in a society based on relations of exploitation of labour, same as the opposites in Nature? In the case of Nature, once the opposites cease to exist, Nature itself will cease to exist. But in society, when there is no exploitation of labor, and antagonistic contradictions cease to exist, that society will be a wonderful society! The real question here is whether the law of contradiction which Hegel had talked applies to the society as it does to Nature. It doesn't. But Engel's words indicate that Hegel's laws apply not only to Nature but also to society and process of thought as well. Only after considering the third law would we clearly understand if Hegel's laws apply to the society or not and if they do, to what extent.

★

18. Hegel's 3rd Law of Dialectics (Negation of Negation)

When a seed of rice falls on the ground, and if that ground is wet, within 4 days that seed will become a tiny plant. Hegel saw a great law in that process of 'seed becoming a plant'. In other words, "plant negated the seed" (made it non-existent). Further it also means that "seed turning into a plant is development". According to Hegel, seed turning into a plant means

plant has negated the seed - this is first negation. First development.

After that, that tiny plant will grow however much it is possible for it to grow. Once the plant is all grown, ears of rice will grow in bunches. Once all these seeds have grown fully, the mother plant slowly dries up and dies. Hegel saw the process of more seeds growing on the plant and the plant dying at the end, and it occurred to him that this process also complies with the earlier rule. This time, "new seeds of rice negated the plant" - this is second negation. Second development. This new development is not same as the earlier development. It should be considered as better than the earlier one. It is not that same thing is occurring again. It can be called as development over development only when there is more development. This way, in a field where rice grows, there will be develop-ment with every crop

Does it mean that if there was a yield of 10 sacks rice in the previous year, there will be a yield of 11 sacks of rice this year? Can such meanings be deduced? Even if it does not exactly mean this, it certainly means that there will be development from one phase to another.

'One seed - plant - more seeds' - this way, it is an order of three phases. Hegel named this process of one seed turning into several seeds as, 'law of negation'. Two negations occurred in this. First, when plant negated the seed, more seeds that came afterwards negated the plant. Considering this from plant's side, it first rejected the seed and then it got rejected. First rejection occurred to the seed. Second rejection occurred to the plant. This process, according to Hegel, is the law "Law of Negation of Negation".

Is it true that negations and developments truly occur in the order of 'seed - plant - seeds'? If this order is indeed considered as 'order of negations' then wording should be in such a way to indicate 'negation of the thing that has negated'. Instead of that, with the wording "Negation of Negation", doesn't it imply that second negation also occurred to the same seed that

was negated in the first place? We should not feel fascinated as soon as we see this law thinking that it is talking about development. There are quite many things to think about this law.

Engels gave Hegel's example of seed of rice to illustrate the law of negation. What does the law of negation state? It states that everything in Nature develops from lower level to a higher level, and that such development continues to occur, and that there is no last phase for development.

But, does the order in which the plant grows and gives lot of seeds, comes under the 'natural order', or does it come under 'order of development'? What kind of change is the change of seed into plant? This is same change as the change in Nature where day changes to night. This is a normal change in Nature. Would we call day, changing into night a "development"? After that night, when another day comes, is it more development? Isn't this 'day - night' order a 'natural process'? Same way, "seed - plant" order. They are phases in a process.

Day, changing into night is a natural change. It is so because day and night occur only due to the changes in places where sun rays fall on the earth. The change in seed changing into plant is either related to life or something else. Still, it is also a change in Nature.

'Seed - plant - seeds' all these 3 phases occur as part of a single process. After this process, the next process too occurs in the same 3 phases. There will be no difference between the first process and 1000th process. If yield of more seeds due to one seed is considered as development, then the first seed that fell on the earth has emerged in the process of the development. It is one among the many seeds that came from a mother plant. Whichever process is considered, there will not be any difference in shape and characteristic of a seed that came from one process and the more seeds that came after. There will not be any new aspects of the development in new seeds. If the first one is a seed of rice, more seeds of rice will come and not seeds of wheat, or gold.

Seeds of rice will come from a seed of rice, but in higher quantity. It is normal for this to happen in Nature. When old seed and new seed have same characteristics, it can't be said that old seed is in a lower level and new seed is in a higher level. New seed could not be a more developed one than the old seed.

If a seed of Mango is considered instead of seed of rice, how would be its process of development? Rice plant dies after one crop But a mango tree gives mangoes in many crops before dying. In case of a mango tree, its life in entirety is its natural order. If there are dissimilarities in mangoes that grow during that life, those dissimilarities are because of changes in health of the mother tree, and not because mangoes in first crop are of low level and the mangoes in later crops are of higher level.

Once there was only one cell (mono-cellular) organism in Nature. In subsequent stages, insects, trees, birds, animals, people and everything else came into being. Living matter has developed to the level of 'human brain'. This is definitely a change in properties of matter. There should be a phase where that change settles at a certain level. This is because, man is a living being with a 'specialty'. All the bodily properties of that being should grow according to that specialty. Each organ of the body has its own specific property. Isn't the formation of the eye final at a particular stage or not? Whatever action should be carried out by the eye will keep happening. That is its character. Same is the case of nose and also brain. Considering all organs together, it means 'formation of body' is complete. Once that phase passes, the phase of decimation of body begins. Looking at things this way, progress in human brain will happen only until a certain fixed level.

From a grain of sand to the globe of sun, everything in Nature is a 'special thing'. Properties of a special thing should be in such a way to uphold its specialty. Insects as insects, trees as trees, birds as birds, animals as animals, people as people, each special thing has settled with its

specialty. Should a process occur again and again in the same order? If there is an eternal development in the body of an ant, how would ant remain as ant? Even, after a thousand generations, ant should remain as ant: Ant's daughter as ant, ant's grand-daughter as ant and so on. In any specific entity, development should occur to the extent possible, continue in that particular level for a while, then change into the phase of getting extinct, and finally go extinct. Instead, if there is continuous development, where is the end to that specialty? It is the law of Nature to let an ant remain as an ant.

When an egg changes into a chick, it is not that egg is at a lower level and chick is at a higher level. For a chick to be born, there should an egg in the first place. Whatever development occurs in an egg, it will keep the egg as egg. Whatever development occurs in a chick, that chick, as a hen must lay eggs. Anything or everything will have its own action it is supposed to do. Development does not change those actions. If development does not stop anywhere, no specific thing will stand by its specialty. Any and every specific thing in Nature should stop in its limits and should perform its actions.

If a single celled life form grows up to the extent of human brain and if we consider that growth in terms of 'development' instead of process of 'evolution', even that development, should stop somewhere or the other. However much the brain power develops, human brain should settle only as human brain. In an ant, or elephant, or sun, if development continues without stopping, any specialty will not stand by its characteristics; there will be no end to it.

But, the law of negation creates such an illusion that in any field, in any aspect, there will be no end to development. I have a big doubt about the development that this law of negation talks about!

It must be seen how much the 3 laws that Hegel had stated, would apply to history of human society. Why did Marx and Engels like Hegel's laws so much?

★

19. Why Did Marx and Engels like Hegel's Laws So Much?

Before Hegel's laws came into being, Materialism, like Idealism, had many shortcomings in it and lacked proper understanding. Even though Hegel's laws were not formulated from a Materialist perspective, when seen separately, they contain correct understanding to some extent together with some mistakes as well.

Hegel did not grasp all the things he said with his own intellect and without any connection to the then existing philosophies. There are aspects that have improved earlier philosophies and there are some that were told based on his own comprehension.

Essence of Hegel's laws is like this: Nothing will remain as it is. Everything keeps changing. Those changes occur due to contradictions inherent in that thing. Those changes always move towards progress."

If society is viewed from this perspective, wouldn't people living in that society like this law or not? - To find an answer to this question, first we should know how 'human relations' exist in society. The society that is in existence is a society consisting of enemy classes. This society consists of a class that performs labour and a class that exploits the labor. In such a society, if any Philosopher says - that 'everything changes, even society changes; that change is not a minor change, It will always move towards progress'— Who would like such words? And who would not like them? The class that exploits would not like it if this society changes. That is why that class does not like Philosophers who talk about "progress."

But, those who know the wickedness of exploitation of labor in this society, would like words such as 'Development will certainly happen, everything will certainly change, these laws of development will be applicable everywhere.' They will develop a feeling of love towards people who say such words. I believe, this is the reason why Marx and Engels liked Hegel's laws so much.

Even though Hegel said his

laws are "laws of inquisitiveness", he gave examples to indicate these laws are happening in Nature. Even though he didn't say much about society, he praised the then existing kingdom in Germany as the magnificent kingdom. In the sense that there was no greater kingdom than that! He, who stated laws according to which 'Everything changes and keeps developing', did not imagine that the kingdom that appeared magnificent to him would also change and should change. He imagined that kingdoms would remain and should remain. Not only that, he stated his laws as if they alone were accurate. He who said, 'there will be development in everything', did not think, that his laws too should change.

Even though there are mistakes in Hegel, Marx and Engels were marveled by words 'changes' 'development' that were found in his laws. We should take anything good irrespective of who says it. We must respect the person who said those things. Marx and Engels have always given their respects to those who deserved them. Similarly, they respected Hegel too, and praised him a lot.

But in my opinion, they did that to extremes. Not only that, I also think that they did not examine the question as to what extent Hegel's laws apply to the society.

★

20. To what extent Hegel's laws Are applicable to the society?

In Nature, there is a relationship of attraction-repulsion between the Sun and the Earth. Same type of relationship exists between the Earth and the Moon. There are connections between the Sun and other planets. Considering the Earth itself, on the Earth there is a relationship between the Earth and an ant. There is a relationship between the Earth and wind. Entire Nature is oneness with interrelationships.

Day to day common sense is enough to understand that it is not possible for humans to live without breathing air, that there is interrelation between humans and air, and that there is

inseparable relation between human beings and the Earth. No high level science is needed to understand this.

The understanding that "human being is part of Nature" was not there in the early Materialism. Materialists at one point of time thought that human beings are completely independent and that they are not part of Nature and to think this way is true Materialism. Few of such erroneous ideas were present in Materialism. Subsequent Philosophers used to rectify and revise such misconceptions of earlier Philosophers.

The three laws that Hegel had stated made Philosophy almost complete. This compliment was bestowed upon Hegel. It should still be seen if Hegel's laws deserve such praise. We need to examine Hegel's laws from the perspective of society.

About the law of opposites: In this law of opposites, all the examples, such as day and night, sunshine and rain, which Hegel had given (as mentioned by authors of articles on Hegel) are related to Nature. We have already seen that the opposites in such pairs are all natural.

Hegel did not talk about antagonistic contradictions that exist in relationships within based on society of exploitation. It does not mean that it was Hegel's mistake that he did not talk about them. Since Hegel did not know about "exploitation of labor", he did not know about 'human relations' and the 'state'. Only when it is known that there are antagonistic contradictions in the society, would it be known that such contradictions are not natural, and that it is possible to abolish them. If antagonistic classes are abolished, antagonistic contra-dictions will be abolished. (Here it is not necessary to talk about non-antagonistic contradictions.)

Opposites in Nature such as day and night, sunshine and rain that Hegel had talked about will always be there. If it is assumed that society also has similar natural law, one has to assume that contradictions (opposites) in the society are also natural, and that they will remain as such. However, contradictions in the society that had emerged since the beginning of exploitation of labor would and should disappear when the exploitation of labor is

eliminated.

The law of opposites that Hegel had stated does not tell the differences that exist between Nature and society. It will be a blunder to think that the law of opposites which pertains to Nature would also apply to society. The law of opposites in Nature does not apply to society as it is. The opposites should be considered only in terms of the circum-stances in society.

On the law of Quantity (Size) – Quality (Property): Even these are examples of Nature, such as a seed changing into a plant; an egg changing into a chick. When an egg changes into a chick, according to this law, it is a new property. In fact, it is not that the egg is at a lower level and the chick is at a higher level. Can we make lower-higher level differentiation between sunshine and rain? Both are equally natural. Same is the case with the egg-chick relationship.

But, the law of quantity and quality implies that such changes are from a lower state to a higher state. It is a new property, when a chick grows into a hen and lays eggs. When the hen dies, that is a third property. A caterpillar changing into a butterfly indicates a lower state changing into a higher state. That is a new property. In fact, in Nature when something forms in a state it is supposed to form, that would be natural. Looking at such natural occurrences in terms of lower and higher, is meaningless and irrational. In Nature, every object is something with a special form. Since there will be an end to it, changes in its properties occur until that object ceases to exist. Those changes stop at the end. But, the law of quantity and quality does not say so. It states as if those changes go on continuously.

If this law of quantity and quality is applied to the exploitative society, when would the character (quality) of this society change? Unless the relationships of exploitation totally change, it can't be said that old character of society has changed. Let us suppose that in society, relationships of exploitation of labor have ceased and that relationships of equality have formed. That means, "Communism" has formed. Inequality in every

aspect of society has changed. That would be a change in the character (quality) of society. That means, an old society at lower state has changed into a new society of a higher quality. That means, the differences in levels that do not apply to aspects in Nature do apply to aspects in society.

Since the new society has formed with relations based on equality, character of society will not and need not change anymore. But, in the law of quantity and quality, there will not be a last stage to anything. There will be nothing like a last character (quality). According to this law, quantity changes into quality; that new quality again changes, into new quantity; such changes keep happening again and again. Even though this law does not give all these details, it implies the same.

When communism is viewed from the perspective of the law of quantity and quality, the relationships of equality too should change and the society should acquire a new character. If 'equality' should change into an even higher level, in what way should that change occur? Since equality cannot change any further, if there should be a change, it should only change backwards. That is, it has to change into 'inequality'. When equality changes into inequality it cannot be considered as a higher state. It does not mean that the law of quantity changing into quality has stated about changing backwards as well. In fact, since there is nothing higher than equality, there won't be a next stage after equality.

In a society that was formed with equality in relationships, there is nothing left in its 'character' (quality) to change. If the kinds of products produced in this society change, small changes may and will occur in the structure of the society. That will not be a change in the quality.

In fact it is natural that 'form' depends on the content (quality). A good society will not produce bad products.

How should Hegel's law of 'quantity and quality, and quality-quantity' operate in communism? This law will not operate there. For a society, relationships of equality constitute permanent character. That character need not change. That means, the law of quality-

quantity will not apply continually to 'special aspects' in Nature, or in a society that does not have antagonistic contradictions.

On the law of negation of negation: This is the law that tells how 'development' (progress) happens. Essence of this law of negations and the law of quantity-quality is same. It is like breaking up the same law into two parts and stating them in different words. Higher level happens by rejecting lower level. 'Development' happens this way. Examples from Nature were given for this law as well.

When this law of negations is considered in terms of how it operates in society from a class perspective, we may assume that feudalism has negated slavery. Such negation results in some progress in labor relations. After that, we have to assume that capitalism negated feudalism. This implies some more development in labour relations. After that, we assume that socialism will negate capitalism. If that happens, it will be further progress. As there will be some shortcomings even in socialism, socialism develops and transforms into communism. Communism implies relations of equality. That will be complete develop-ment. Still, if development should happen over that development, it should go beyond equality. Since that is not possible, development should stop at equality. Equality will be the last stage of development.

However, according to the law of negation of negation, development does not stop anywhere. Development keeps continuing. That means, according to this law, communism too should be negated. Equality should leave and something else should replace it. Even if that something else happens, it will also be negated. Even that should go away. Everything should keep coming and going. So, at the end what kind of relationships should remain in the society? No, there is nothing like 'permanency' in relationships. There is no question of whether the new development is good or not. Even that new development will change. It must change. That is what law of negation of negation says!

Philosophers are not scientists. They will say whatever comes to their mind.

They do take some support from science. Hegel, the Philosopher, stated whatever he thought. We can't say that there is nothing to pay attention to in those laws. However, people with class outlook will consider whether or not these laws are relevant to the class society, if relevant to what extent.

When Marx and Engels read the law of negation of negation, did they not think of questions such as 'Should negation happen to communism as well? Is there more develop-ment than relations of equality?' - This surprises me.

How old were Marx and Engels when they read Hegel's laws? Marx read Feuerbach in 1843. He read Hegel before that. That is, before he was 23 years old. It is not that he liked Hegel because he read Hegel when he was young. He liked Hegel even at the time of writing 'Capital'. In countries where slavery was there, it was seen that slavery was gone due to struggles by slaves. That can be definitely considered as at least some development. After that feudal societies have changed into bourgeois societies. It is also some development. Hegel's laws talk about 'development'. Hence it is only natural for Hegel's laws, which talk about development, to make people who knew about developments in society, happy. That is why Marx and Engels must have liked Hegel's laws so much. With the law of negations, they must have felt happy that capitalist society will also be negated and they both must have thought that Hegel's laws were fantastic.

There is one of more of Hegel's laws, which is "Triad". This is a law of three terms.

Argument X -Counter argument = Equal argument

Position X Opposite position = Equal position

(Thesis X Antithesis = Synthesis)

The dictionaries of Philosophy give the meaning of the word 'Thesis' as 'position', 'argument', 'proposal', 'theory'. When there is a problem, there will be varieties of arguments about it. The way those arguments should proceed is explained by that 3 term Triad. Only when there is a counter opinion over an opinion, it can be called an 'arguments'. At the end any one of the arguments could win. Or, two

arguments could change a bit and become one. At the end there will be a result. Today, world is full of societies with antagonistic classes. One has to look into the details of 'Triad' in order to apply it.

There are some more things to be looked into.

★

21. Hegel had ruled Philosophy!

In fact, I feel very much vexed with Hegel's laws. So much that I feel that those laws are unnecessary. That is because Philosophy has become a synonym for Vedanta. However, Marx and Engels are not such people who should be ignored. We should pay attention to whatever they say and learn from them. We can ask questions if there are any doubts. But, only after listening to what they have to say! From this view point, I have interest in the 'noise' of Philosophy. I am interested in Marx and Engels and not in Philosophy.

Whatever Engels had written, praising Hegel's laws of dialectics, was all based only on aspects of Nature. It is said that nobody cared about Hegel's laws in the beginning. Moreover, it seems, some people had even mocked at those laws. It seems they said, 'What Hegel is saying appears to be an incomprehensible logic!', "Don't we know that a seed becomes a plant and an egg becomes a chick?"

As an answer to such sarcasms and criticism, Engels explains how special is the law of quantity-quality is:

> "Probably the same gentlemen who up to now have decried the transformation of quantity into quality as mysticism and incomprehensible trans-cendentalism will now declare that it is indeed something quite self-evident, trivial, and commonplace, which they have long employed, and so they have been taught nothing new. But to have formulated for the first time in its universally valid form a general law of develop-ment of Nature, society, and thought, will always remain an act of historic importance." (Dialectics of Nature, page-68.)

This implies that change in quality due to change in 'Quantity' is applicable to Nature, society, thought, and everywhere else. He did not mention if there will be variances in changes that happen 'everywhere'. He did not mention if the laws in Nature apply to the society in the same manner.

'Society' is not a 'thing'. It is not an 'object'. Human relationships constitute society. Society means human relationships. Society does not end in two or three stages like a seed or an egg. Human society will exist as long as there are humans on this planet. What kind of effect would the law of quantity-quality have on society?

Would the new quality that has formed, in accordance with the law of quantity-quality, definitely better than the old quality or could it be at a lesser level than the old quality? - Only when the quality has a higher characteristic than the old quality can it be called 'new quality'. It would not be a new quality, if there is no change from old quality, or if it changes backwards, isn't it?

In fact, the division of 'old - new' is very wrong. In case of society the division should be as 'good - bad.' 'Old' quality should go away only when there is 'bad' in it. It should remain as it is if there is good in it.

Let us assume that new qualities should keep forming as per the law of quantity-quality. Let us imagine one particular stage. Say, in society, 'exploitation of labor' is all gone. Old division of labor has changed. Commodity production is gone. Haves and have-nots are gone. Everyone is working with real responsibility. Everyone is using products as per their needs. System of wages is all gone. After all these changes, relationships of equality exist. How should relationships of equality change if a quality of a higher level should happen in such a society? Should they change or not? What is the higher quality than equality?

In human relationships there is no higher quality than equality. It is not possible to build such higher quality. That means, the law of quantity-quality is applicable only until the stage of equality and does not produce a new quality beyond that. Aim of that law is to make equality to continue.

According to Hegel's law new qualities and develop-ments should keep happening forever. There is a strange meaning to all this. It implies that there will be shortcomings in development in whatever way the development happens. There will be development only when there is a deficiency. There will be shortcomings even if 100 developments happen in 100 stages. 101st development will have to happen. Even then, there will be deficiencies. There will be deficiencies even when 1000th development happens. What is the use of develop-ments if deficiencies do not exist? That means, Hegel's law of development will never lead to right development. It will always make erroneous changes. The new changes that come after the old ones also have come with errors, which are new errors. The Philosopher who talked about "perpetual development" did not know how erroneous this law is. If society wants perpetual development, it has to suffocate with defects perpetually.

All this confusion is because of all praise but without proper clarity on Hegel's laws. May be those details are absent in Hegel's writing. The difficulty in understanding Hegel's style of writing is often referred to as '*coconut-made sweet* (*naarikela paakam*), the consumption (eating) of which involves lot of effort.

On Hegel: Hegel was appointed as professor in Berlin University in 1818. There he became famous and an important figure. He wrote many great works while he was there. The entire country used to talk about his works. However his works were hard (like coconut) to understand. The notes of his lectures which his students prepared turned into books. He himself wrote '**Logic**' and '**Phenomenology**'. As one critic observed they were as hard as coconut to understand. It is said that his style is so concentrated that it is very difficult to enter into it and his two works contain terminology of his own. The admiration, fanfare, and royal honour bestowed on him were unprecedented. His innumerable disciples included many stalwarts. Feuerbach, Bayer, Moleplal were among them. Needless to mention Marx, who formulated Dialectical Materialism and

Historical Materialism….. As Will Turont said,

'Hegel ruled Philosophy just as Goethe ruled literary world and Beethoven ruled the music world. Hegel died of cholera in 1831.' (From '*Hegel and Hegelianism*)

Marx became the disciple of this Hegel.

★

22. How smart materialists Women are!

Here, we cannot yet see Marx's words indicating that he is Hegel's disciple. Marx's words that we will see here were taken from a 'foreword' to 'Capital'. Only when we see these words would we know the context in which Marx called himself as Hegel's disciple. We should talk about our response while looking at these words.

"My dialectical method is not only different from the Hegelian, but is its direct opposite. To Hegel, the life-process of the human brain, i.e. the process of thinking, which, under the Nature of 'the Idea', he even transforms into an independent subject, is the demiurgos of the real world, and the real world is only the external, phenomenal form of 'the Idea'. With me, on the contrary, the ideal is nothing else than the material world reflected by the human mind, and translated into forms of thought." (Marx in Capital, vol. 1, page29, Moscow edition, 1974.)

Considering what Marx said so far, we should be able to understand what 'Idealism' is. But I have not understood it. Would a person say that the process of thinking created the real world? It is different thing if one says, 'God has created the real world.' It is understandable when people, who believe that god has magical powers, say such things. By "man's thinking", which man's thinking is it? Let us say it is not a specific person, but any man's thinking. When one says that Man has created, does it mean that Man alone created these trees and the like? No, it doesn't.

Does Hegel mean as follows: There is no external world in reality. Only Man exists.

Man exists without the external world. Man imagines that there is external world (as if there are trees and so forth) and thus creates an external word in his imagination. The form of the eternal world depends on the way a given Man imagines it. Is this what Hegel says? If he says that man exists without the world, without the earth - is this any better?

If the tree that man sees is not real and it is just a figment of imagination then even that man cannot be real. That man is also a figment of imagination. If a man exists without the world, then how can that man be anything but imagination? In man's view, isn't the imaginary tree a real tree? When both are imaginary, they are indeed real for one another.

Any Idealist would believe that 'God has created this universe, Universe is everywhere,' wouldn't he? In that case, how would an Idealist say that there is nothing in front of Men and that Men are imagining as if there is something? - This is a good question but, I think it is possible to understand an Idealist only when we assume that 'no Idealist follows logic." If we do not understand the fact that 'an Idealist does not have logic", it is not possible to understand any Idealist. How can we put any questions to those who do not talk logically? Instead we have to pity them 'Alas, how spoilt they are'? Even if we ask questions, more questions will come up based on their nonsensical answers. We have to leave them at some point or the other.

Doesn't an Idealist know that "universe" does exist in reality and that is what appears to Men? He too knows it. He too is a human being. When he sees a tree, would that person think "this tree is not for real, it is just my imagination?" - That is a lie. He would not think that way.

Every Idealist acts as a Materialist in his real life. He eats food when he gets hungry. He covers his head with hands when it rains while taking a walk. He wears shoes while walking outside, to protect his feet from rocks. In fact Hegel would have eaten every meal and be an intelligent Materialist. But while teaching he thinks it is great to teach Idealism. This kind of people do such things.

Nowhere do we find words

from Hegel's original writings in the essays on Philosophy. We have to assume that it is not easy to understand those sayings, even if we come across. Pundits think that "It is a great thing to write unintelligibly." Hegel also has written incomprehensibly, so he too must have been a Pundit. Only such words which indicate "Hegel means this" appear in articles written about Hegel. This is what I have seen in books I have read. All those are said by Hegelians.

"*The real world is only the external, phenomenal form of the Idea*"— what is the meaning of these observations of Marx on Hegel's dialectics? Marx interprets Hegel as follows: There is something external to Man. But it is not the real world. It is the phenomenal form of real world. It is this form that appears to the human senses. What humans see is not the actual picture but a form. What humans hear is not the real sound but its form. Hegel's thinking goes along these line. (This is how I understood it.)

I believe what Marx says about the way Hegel thinks. Because it is Marx who is saying it. I will believe even if Engels says it.

That is what Hegel means! However, if whatever humans see is just the 'form' of the world, then where does the 'actual world' exist? What does Hegel say about where the world exists? In the books I have read, there is no indication of a Materialist asking an Idealist the question, "Where does the actual world exist?" and there is no indication of an Idealist answering that question.

Moreover, arguments between them appear in books as follows: "Would the form of a thing exist separately from that thing or not?" as if it is a big problem! As if it is a problem that can't be understood without a debate!

May be Idealist feel that form of an object is like a shirt or a blouse, which that object wears. That is why they think that it is possible for the form to leave the object. Idealists and Materialists argue giving examples of objects. Considering the tree, Idealists argue that "tree's form is away from the tree" and Materialists argue that "form will not be far from the tree." We don't find in books the details about those arguments, where

Materialists ask Idealists to "Show how form of the tree is far from the tree" and if the Idealists have shown it to them. Even if Marx had wanted to ask Hegel that question, Hegel was not around by the time Marx had grown a little. And Engels was still a little boy. Even this kid could not ask.

Even though Hegel had died, he "would be continuously developing" somewhere or the other. He can't be found, but his 'form' can be found. Hegel's 'form' should be asked the questions that Hegel was supposed to be asked. It is not that Marx alone should pose those questions. Where does Marx find that kind of time? He has so many writing assignments. Even we can pose our questions to Hegel's form. But would there be a crazier person than the one who would argue, 'am I right or are you right' with someone who says, "While the actual tree is somewhere else, it's form is in our garden"? Why should we waste our time like that?

In fact, before anything, I want to leave the form alone and see the actual tree. If the 'form' leaves the actual tree and comes in front of us, hadn't the actual tree left the form somewhere? Don't you want to see how that tree looks like?

Have I correctly understood what Marx said about the argument of the Idealists be? This is what frustrates me about myself from the beginning. Is this really what Idealists are saying? Why doesn't this doubt leave me?

If there is someone who really says that "What people see is not the actual universe. It is the shadow. of the universe. This is the shadow of the universe." someone should be kind enough to get them treated medically. It is the duty of Materialists. It is the responsibility of fellow human beings.

I find one ray of happiness in all this annoyance. And that is, there are no women among these Idealist Philosophers. There will be female worshippers, but no female Idealists. Even if there was one woman like that, all women would have lost their reputation as women. And in case of men, where is the respectability in men, for them to lose it? They lost it long back. Their wisdom and their scholarly discussions, constitute their world, aren't they? That is why in

that world, Idealism, craziness, Materialists' discussions with them, are still prevailing.

Women, who wake up early in the morning, wash dishes, sweep rooms, cook food and take care of the kids, are the best Materialists! Is there anything in their behavior or in their talks that can't be understood? What is incompre-hensible is the greatness and the scholarliness of men! In reality such things are so horrific. Alas, poor guys! ★

23. Hegel cannot be the teacher of Marx

Marx claimed that he was a disciple of Hegel. It is pity that Hegel could not claim that Marx was his disciple. No ignorant person who worships the 'universal spirit' can be the teacher of a Materialist. Didn't Marx know this much? This is a surprise to me! However, the context, the devotion, and fervor for the notion of development were such!

Later we can see in Marx's own words why he showed so much humility. However, I never liked Marx's humility towards Hegel. Not only Marx and Engels, no one else needs to attach so much value to the Hegel's concepts of develop-ment and contradiction. Certainly not Marx and Engels.

The antagonistic contradic-tions present in the society cannot be proved unless the secret of exploitation of labour is unraveled first. In the primitive times, when the exploitation of labour had not yet begun, and when the members of the defeated tribes have become the slaves and the members of the victorious tribes became Masters as a result of the conflicts between the tribes for the natural resources, it all appeared 'justified'. What else would be the relation of a defeated person to the victorious person if not a slave? When this slave toils day and night for the master, the fact that the surplus labour is going daily from this slave to the master does not appear. What appears outwardly is only the 'slavery'. This, however, was 'justified'; since the slaves were the defeated

people!

In the subsequent period of time also, the slavery was justified; since these people did not have the means of production. How can those poor people, who did not have even a tiny piece of land to grow a fistful of grain, be masters, and not the slaves of the person who owns those means of production? They cannot be.

Until the recent times, until Marx discovered the fact of exploitation of labour and calculated 'surplus value' of the labouring class and declared that 'this injustice has been perpetuating over the past thousands of years,' the truth of the existence of the antagonistic contradictions in the human relations was not revealed.

Exploitation of labour is the clear basis of the existence of antagonistic contradictions in the human relations. When Hegel pronounced that: 'The day and the night switch places; a seed grows into a plant; an egg will hatch into a chick; this becomes that, and that becomes this; the contradictions cause this, and the motion does that,' these utterences had become great wisdom. This was because there was no one else in those days who pronounced this much wisdom. The maxims of Hegel, nevertheless, did not derive from empirical experimentation and proofs. Although these maxims may have been factual, they were the products of imagination. This imagination appeared grand looking.

Marx's research had resulted in discovering a truth called 'the surplus value of the labouring class'. There is proof of the 'exploitation of labour perpetrated by the class of Masters'. Marx had thorough knowledge of the antagonistic contradictions of the classes and the class struggles of the slaves. Marx, the truth seeker, was fascinated by Hegel's imaginations such as 'nothing is constant. The society will change. There will be development' and so on.

Since Hegel was not aware of the phenomenon of exploitation of labour in the human society, he was also not aware of the antagonistic contradictions. What he described were the contradictions found in the Nature. In the past, others also envisioned these happenings although not fully. The improvisation of these

imaginations by Hegel acquired a grand proportion! Indeed, we may be thrilled by the maxim of a Philosopher that: 'development takes place constantly'. If we do not grasp the point that the Law of Constant development will upset the concepts of Communism, we may continue to feel happy holding on to that of Law of Development.

Did Marx not realize this point? Sure, Marx knew everything. Nevertheless, he submitted himself as a disciple to the intellect of the proponent of the universal spirit! Just as the idiotic devotees who had avenged by labeling Spinoza, an atheist of the past, using the mean epithet 'a dead dog', the exploiting classes too had similarly showered curses on Hegel who declared that 'the society will keep changing'.

The meanness which the exploiters exhibited towards the Philosopher who argued that society will keep changing caused lot of anger in Marx. At that point of time Marx declared himself a disciple of that Philosopher. We will see Marx's declarations regarding his apprentice later. But before that, we must consider what Marx said regarding the differences between the Hegel's Idealist dialectics and his Materialist dialectics. ★

24. What is the difference between Hegel's logic and Marx's logic?

Marx said that his dialectics is not only different from that of Hegel, but it is also totally opposed. We have to consider this point here.

> Marx: "My dialectical method is not only different from the Hegelian, but is its direct opposite…With me…the ideal is nothing else than the material world reflected by the human mind, and translated into forms of thought." (Marx in Capital, vol. 1, page-29, Moscow edition, 1974.)

According to these words, there exists 'a real material' world. The human being is an integral part of that world. The image of what exists in the outside world falls on the human mind. Thoughts originate in the

mind as a consequence of the external images. This is how any Materialist will explain the thought. As a Materialist, Marx did the same.

Let us hear more of Marx regarding this.

> Marx: "The mystifying side of Hegelian dialectic I criticized nearly thirty years ago, at a time when it was still the fashion. But just as I was working at the first volume of "Das Kapital," it was the good pleasure of the peevish, arrogant, mediocre, who now talk large in cultured Germany, to treat Hegel in same way as the brave Moses Mendelssohn in Lessing's time treated Spinoza, i.e., as a "dead dog." I therefore openly avowed myself the pupil of that might thinker, and even here and there, in the chapter on the theory of value, coquetted with the modes of expression peculiar to him." (Capital, vol. 1, page-29).

There could be a few good things in the Laws proposed by Hegel. One may even apply these Laws to any empirical examination. However, can someone who stated that: 'The form of the tree exists independent of the tree' be a 'mighty thinker'? Can one who does not know even about the tree become a teacher to Marx? Can an intellectual who exposed the exploiting classes of the world showing the evidence in the form of value calculation, be a disciple of an ignorant person who is unaware of even a tree? Alas! How undeserving credit Marx conferred on Hegel! Having adopted a few styles of expression from Hegel, Marx caught unawares in that delight! But those who understand Marx as an intellectual who grasped the past, present and future relations of the human beings; and Hegel as an ignorant person who embraced the monarchy and stopped behind cannot accept Hegel as the teacher of Marx.

We need to hear what Marx says about Hegel.

> "The mystification which dialectics suffers in Hegel's hands, by no means prevents him from being the first to present its general form of working in a comprehensive and conscious manner. With him it is standing on its head. It must be turned right side up again, if you would discover

the rational kernel within the mystical shell." (Capital -1)

Marx says that Hegel represents 'Idealist dialectics' and hence it must be transformed into 'Materialist dialectics'. How did Marx and Engels transform this Philosophy? The same question which occurred to me while reading the same point in Engels. Can the deductions drawn without studying Nature (as Engels observed) be considered as the Laws of Nature? In addition, another question has now occurred to me here. What change has transpired here to transform the Idealist Laws into Materialist Laws? Marx called these Laws 'a rational kernel' – implying that they are 'Laws of Nature'. Marx recognizes this principle as rational. He said that the Laws lie in a wrong shell of 'thought'.

Some facts of Nature appear in those laws. In such examples as seed and the plant. We can also see a few developments in the society as a testimonial to the principle of 'development'. Although the Idealist envisioned these Laws as the Laws of thought, the cause for these Laws is Nature. We must consider them as the Laws of Nature, not of thought – infers Marx. Marx and Engels considered that the mask of mystification would be lifted when these Laws are understood as the Laws of Nature but not of thought. This is how it must be transformed, according to Marx and Engels. Since these Laws that existed in the name of thought appear to be Laws of Nature, Marx and Engels labeled them as the Laws of Nature or Laws of Materialism. I initially thought it was just a change of names. Because these Laws are appropriate, the change of the name has transpired with a perspective. To view these Laws as Laws of thought is Hegel's logic and to view them as Materialistic is the Marx's logic. Having understood so, I realized subsequently that this was just not the change of names.

Still there remains a question. Do the Laws of Nature apply to the society as they are? Engels made statements implying that these Laws apply 'to universe, to Nature, history, the thought and to all aspects'. We have seen Engels statements previously (in his

'Dialectics of Nature').

Marx did not leave behind even a note regarding this point as Engels did. In '*Capital*', he used expressions such as the quantity transforming into quality and the negation of negations, etc. Just because he used those expressions, we cannot consider it as his final view on these Laws.

Marx made several rational statements regarding communism that it represents 'the abolition of the hostile classes', 'classlessness' and 'the equality of human relations'. It is quite strange that he did not question, in any context, the significance of the Hegel's Law of negation. 'What would be the meaning of communism, if negations take place in human relations eternally?' – He, perhaps, would have described in great details if ever got an opportunity to write a treatise on 'dialectics'! Should one wait for a detailed essay to make a statement that must be made as soon as one read about the Law of negations? If one feels happy that Capitalist system will be abolished, won't another question crop up: what next (after capitalism)? Will communism also represent a transient phase comprising of hostile classes? If the classes and the contradictions are never to be removed, then, when and how there will be 'classlessness'? Is classlessness a lie? Which means, is communism a lie?

★

25. What will be after communism?

Hegel assumed a few Laws; Opposites, motion, low Level, higher level, old development and advanced and continuous forms of development, and so on! There are no details regarding what Hegel calls a development.

Based on a person's ideas, the meaning of 'development' may vary. For a believer, enrichment of theist thoughts will be development, and for a nonbeliever, development of atheist thoughts. So far so good. If there is a continuous development in the thought process of a person, at what level would be his thought at the time of his demise? A continuous development in the thought of the believer, where

would it have reached? Likewise, with continuous development in the thought of an atheist, what level of development it would have reached?

It is enough to say that 'development constantly takes place.' A little elaboration is necessary. And, those people who honor the Law of development should at least seek more details.

Hegel proposed 'continuous development.' He did not provide its details. For him, however, there was no need to define the Nature of the development. Society would change depending on how its population change it. The people will have to bring about the kind of development they need. It depends on the people. This is the meaning of the development Hegel talked: 'bring about the change you want.' Then, why development cannot have a phase of finality? Did Hegel think that 'these folks cannot be wise enough to bring about a perfect development'? Could that be the reason development cannot have a final phase?

Hegel's concept of development is fine, but should Marx and Engels learn about development from Hegel? Despite being armed with a theory of their own that would enable them to grasp as to what was more developed than Capitalist society, and through what kind of class struggles a class society could achieve the higher level, did Marx and Engels find the concept of development originated from the imaginations of a Philosopher as a guideline?

The words of the Philosopher which meant that 'nothing is stable; this society will change,' made Marx and Engels extremely happy just as the same words enraged the exploiters.

See how much revolution did Marx find in Hegel's Laws!

> Marx: "In its mystified form, dialectic became the fashion in Germany, because it seemed to transfigure and to glorify the existing state of things. In its rational form it is a scandal and abomination to bourgeoisdom and its doctrinaire professors, because it includes in its comprehension and affirmative recognition of the existing state of things, at the same time also, the recognition of the negation of that state, of its inevitable breaking up;

because it regards every historically developed social form as in fluid movement, and therefore takes into account its transient Nature not less than its momentary existence; because it lets nothing impose upon it, and is in its essence critical and revolutionary." (Capital -1)

According to Marx, Hegel's dialectics was in a 'mystified' form, but it was quite revolutionary! We can say so because Hegel's dialectics not only recognizes the prevailing conditions but also realizes that these conditions 'will disappear and inevitably be disintegrated.'

This does not mean that Hegel understood that the prevailing society was an exploitative system.

This is only to say that since the Laws are logical, they lead us to recognize the 'bad' aspects of the system.

Let us consider one more sentence of Marx. With regard to Hegel's Law which says that any historically developed society will change, it seems that Marx paid attention to only the disappearance of Capitalist system and not beyond.

According to Hegel, the question of whether it is good or bad does not arise with reference to any historically developed system. It must invariably change. Every historical period is transitory in Nature. No phase is 'permanent'. Even if development takes place based on the relations of equality, such a system too is not valid. This is the Law of development in Hegel's dialectics. We have already considered this aspect.

Of the Laws of Hegel, the Law of development impressed Marx and Engels so much that their attention was focused only on 'the disappearance of Capitalist system'. They did not get any doubt 'whether the Communism too would vanish eventually.' Did they think that a more advanced system than the communist society would emerge? In that case, they would have provided a clarification, thus: 'Until now, we have been thinking only up to communism. But, after this phase, there will be still greater development,' They would have said so in their writings. But, they did not say so anywhere. A doubt about vanishing of Communism would not arise even in their dreams.

Regarding the communism, Marx and Engels had always

stressed on the abolition of exploitation of labour! Then, the antagonistic contradictions will disappear. The master-labourer relations will not remain. There would be no need of commodity production. No need for money-calculations. These were not changes professed out of whimsical or Idealistic imagination. They were the changes purported based on the perspective of 'the use value and the exchange value'. They were the thoughts expressed from a rational outlook to end the relations of exploitation and inequality.

Let us assume that a society of this Nature, of a historical phase, has indeed been formed. Can there be further development for such a society? How can the relations based on equality transform into a more developed form? What is the improved form of equality?

If the development is half-baked, then there is a prospect of improvisation. Is not the formation of a 'classless system' accompanied by appropriate changes, an 'adequate' development? If the communism must undergo a transformation, we must be able to enumerate at least a dozen names of the phases expected to emerge subsequently. The past societies, characterized by the presence of hostile classes, had such names as the slave society, the feudal society, and Capitalist society. Thus, depending on the Nature of the class relations, each of the past phases acquired an appropriate name. Based on the given name, we can understand which hostile classes existed in which phase. In the subsequent phases, 'socialism' would be a phase where the hostility between the hostile classes diminish. After that, a phase where the antagonistic relations are completely abolished in all the domains and all aspects it will be 'communism' society. If more advanced phases form after the communism, then, we must deliberate in detail regarding those phases, the differences between those phases, and the forms the human relations will assume in those phases.

If we call the communism a 'development phase-1,' what should we call 'development phase-2'? We cannot name these phases as development phase-3, development phase-4,

or development phase-10. Those who are familiar with the Marxism understand what form the human relations will assume in communism. We must know in what new format the human relations will transform in development phase-2, subsequent to the Communism.

Do you say, 'the changes will be clearer after the Communism, not now?' Don't we know about 'communism' even before it emerged? Have we seen communism? We talk about it by means of logic. When we thus know about communism, can't we use the same logical reasoning and perceive the stage subsequent to communism? Why not? To know just one succeeding phase would suffice. If we consider the human relations of 'absolute equality' as communism, what should we call a phase higher than that? Should we call it an 'absolute-absolute' phase? Or an absolute phase-2? And the phase after that – absolute phase-3? Adding 'absolute' to each of the succeeding phases. In this manner, should we keep enhancing the advanced phases and, accordingly, the 'absolute' numbers? Sure, we can manage to name these phases somehow. But, the point is that we should guess what form the human relations will assume in these new and newer phases. That is what needed. ★

26. 'Perpetual development' in society is illogical development!

We call Idealism an 'irrational' thinking. Although the principles of Idealism too are based on the principles of Nature, they will be irrational to some extent depending on how they are formulated. Materialists should examine what is right and what is wrong in the principles of Idealism. We have to leave wrong aspects behind and accept right aspects if there are any.

Let us reconsider briefly what is right and what is wrong in Hegel's principles.

1) On contradictions (the opposites): The Law of contradictions in Nature does not apply as it is to the human society. The contradictions of Nature are natural. They will remain forever. A 'society'

implies relations of labour. As long as exploitation of labour exists, antagonistic contradictions in the labour relations will remain. The hostile contradictions, however, will not remain forever. When the exploitation disappears, the antagonistic (hostile) contradictions too will disappear. In contrast, the non-antagonistic (friendly) contradictions will come and go in both the periods when exploitation is present as well as absent. During these different phases, the friendly contradictions differ from one another in many ways in character and intensity. The health of the human beings is a Nature-related phenomenon. However, if hostilities exist in social relations, they enter the human health as well. Only when such antagonistic contradictions, which affect the health disappear, the human beings recover from ill health. In such relations, the friendly contradictions are neither natural phenomena that occur always nor they are unnatural phenomena that never occur. We need to understand the difference between contradictions found in the Nature on the one hand and society on the other. This distinction is not found in Hegel's explanation.

2) Continuous motion: In the case of nature, continuous motion remains associated with an object until the object comes to an end. If a fruit is rotting, it implies that there is a motion in the fruit. If the living beings turn old, it implies that there is a continuous motion in the living beings. Aging is a natural phenomenon. But, is a social phenomenon too similar to this? In the case of society, there exists motion in relations as long as hostile contradictions are present. When exploitation exists no longer, only the processes of production and reproduction will make the motion. That will be motion that goes on regularly in the society. The births and deaths constitute natural motion.

3) The principle of quantity and quality: Unless we consider many examples, we cannot form the right perspective regarding this principle. When a seed germinates into a plant and grows into a tree, this is a

change in the quantity. We may consider the tree as a higher level object and the seed as a lower level object; but, the tree gives seeds, doesn't it? Won't this mean that a lower level object can emerge from a higher level object? Anything emerging from a higher level must be of higher level. How can the contrary be possible? For the tree to emerge, there must be the seed first. In that case, how can one object be inferior and the other superior? To Consider the natural relations as superior or inferior is meaningless.

The snow, water and steam: among these three phases which one is inferior and which one superior? These phases transform into one another. The quantities and their changes, all are natural. How are differences in their levels applicable between such phases? These are phenomena in Nature.

Only up to the formation of the Communism, will there exist qualitative changes in the human relations, and their elevation to a higher level in societal matters. After that, the proper quality, namely, 'the relations of equality' will continue. That means, 'the principle of quantity and quality' is not a phenomenon that can perpetuate in the society forever.

4) The principle of negation: This principle proposes 'an endless development'. Whatever happens in Nature is natural. A natural phenomenon cannot develop further. To imply 'development' in the natural phenomena is meaningless! We may use the word 'development' in order to understand the changes easily.

In societal matters, phases of development are applicable only up to the emergence of Communism. After that, it would be only the continuation of those relations.

This means, Hegel's principles need many modifications. These modifications must be made based on the Nature of the relations of labour prevalent in the society. Some aspects of Hegel's Laws must be revised, and the others discarded totally. Those principles are not valid as they are.

Only by correcting the principles of Idealism and by

removing errors, it is possible to add them to Materialism. Only such a perspective can turn those principles of Idealism from a position of being upside down.

'Continuous development' is an insane development that cannot withstand the logical reasoning! Unless this concept is clear, those who want to learn about communism will remain confused. We must have clarity with regard to what to accept and what to reject from the preaching of Philosophers.

We can talk about society without hesitation. After 'equality', further development will not be applicable to the society. There could be variations in the Nature of the products, and their forms, but not changes in the 'quality' of the human relations. After the formation and consolidation of the relations of equality, the continuation of these relations alone will be the development. Equality is not a temporary phase; not even a transient phase. The processes of production, reproduction, and the continuity of equality – these constitute the motion of the society. ★

27. A few more Ideas of Hegel

Having considered the three Laws that brought fame to Hegel through Marx and Engels, Hegel is not relevant to us anymore. However, there are a few more things just for time pass.

Perhaps there is a fistful of people who read Hegel. Among them, those who understood Hegel, we do not know how many fingers are needed to count them. If the readers cannot understand a writer, the writer will become quite famous. The general perception is that there is some scholarly content in it and hence unintelligible. The readers do not suspect that there are issues which are impossible to grasp in it and hence the writing is incomprehensible.

The bottom line is that, many readers, could not understand Hegel. The readers did not understand if it was the scholarly acumen or the lack of sense that made the writing incomprehensible. They could not make out which of the two reasons was the cause.

There is only a handful who read, claimed to have understood, and interpreted Hegel. Based on those interpretations, many more people reinterpreted Hegel. That makes it at least two handfuls. And those who translated these handfuls are many more. Perhaps four fistfuls. This is what 'development' in any domain is. We do not know if there is constant development in this aspect, but nothing surpasses as development the affection of Marx and Engels for Hegel. This could be the ultimate development.

There existed rationalists and atheists even before Hegel. Hegel, the scholar, knew fairly well that such intellectuals and thought processes existed. Nevertheless, the genius of Hegel strove only to compare different religions and find differences between them. Comparing the Christian and the Jewish religions, Hegel was critical of Jewish religion. And, comparing the Christian and Greek religions, Hegel praised the Greek religion. (I took this information from the essay '*Hegel and Hegelianism*' in Encyclopedia of Philosophy. All citations and comments referring to Hegel are based on this essay only.)

Hegel's critique of Jesus:

> "Even before he wrote '**Life of Jesus**', Hegel had written some comments on Christianity in which he criticized it for its belief in the efficacy of prayer and had contrasted it, to its detriment, with the this-worldly, social religion of the Greeks. Jesus, he held, was obscurantist and narrow-minded in comparison with Socrates."
>
> "In the 'Life of Jesus'…he (Hegel) began by claiming that God is pure reason. He described Jesus as the son of Joseph and Mary."

In his book, Hegel portrayed the various events of Jesus' life as common episodes, not as miracles as depicted by the Christianity.

> Jesus "could not have obtained a hearing from the Jews of his day if he had not claimed God's authority for his teachings."

(The following quotes shown as Hegel's are taken from other interpreters. These statements are the interpretations

of the critics. Some of these statements are directly cited by the interpreters from the original works of Hegel. Some other statements are the interpretation of the critics. Indeed, they all are Hegel's ideas.)

> "Jesus demands attention for his teachings, not because they are adapted to the moral needs of our spirit but because they are God's will."

Hegel's criticism of Jesus proceeds as follows: Jesus ought to have projected his teachings as 'ethical necessities'. Instead, he asked people to listen his teachings as teachings of God since they are divine commands.

> **Hegel:** "In claiming to be a messiah, Jesus was using the language his listeners would understand."

Hegel criticizes that such a preaching is sin. How did Hegel, who opposed the portrayal of the wonders (miracles) of the religion, begin his own book with the sentence 'God, the absolute incarnation of knowledge'? Let us consider that he desired to say that 'knowledge is divine'. Knowledge must be portrayed as knowledge, why should he add god to knowledge? Does it not amount to speaking miracles? Is there a miracle-less god? Or did he mean that God was a part of Nature? Why call something 'god', when it is a part of Nature? And, what is the meaning of the words he said after he matured a little such as 'absolute spirit', 'absolute idea', and 'the universe is a form the senses can sense'? Are there no wonders in these words? Are all these elements routine and natural events in the daily life? Is Hegel qualified to be critical of Jesus for talking about god?

The Hegel's perception of slaves:

The critics say that Hegel defined the 'material world' elegantly in his book '*The phenomenology*'. Marxists are reportedly fond of this work. (But it is extremely difficult to understand the Telugu translations of Hegel's English versions.)

> **Hegel**: "The physical world of scientific theory presupposes self-conscious beings. When he analyzed selfconsciousness, Hegel argued that it presupposes a plurality of living and desiring beings each of whom seeks to subdue the

world to his own wishes, to make it part of himself."

Hegel asserts that every person living in the material world attempts to shape the world according to personal desires! It is 'every person' who desires so. In addition to the Masters, Hegel added also 'slaves' to the list of the persons!

Hegel describes the Slave's fear of the Master as follows: '*The slave's work is a consequence of his fear of the Master who can kill him.*' On one hand, Hegel states that the master has a right even to kill the slave and on the other hand Hegel considers both the slaves and masters as equal human beings.

While searching for food and foraging the natural resources, the animals always desire to climb the trees, swim the waters, overcome the dangers and escape the natural perils. Even the primitive human beings desire to do so. After the formation of the hostile classes consisting of the slaves and masters in the society, and after the society realized the fact, a slave behaves in accordance with the commands of the master. A slave would perform any arduous task, turning the mountains upside down for the granite, or reaching the abysmal depths of the earth for the metal, any such task, he would perform only when ordered by the master. If the task is not necessary to the master, he will not do it.

A slave cannot be dream of any desires or thoughts other than those necessary to protect his own person from the whiplashes unleashed day and night and from the fangs of the watchdogs that tear the flesh from his limbs. Hegel equates such slaves with the masters and treats them with the same rules. Everywhere, he brings forth the laws of Nature and the laws of the animals and applies these laws to the human society.

The intended meaning of Hegel was that the slave-human being too "*seeks to subdue the world to his wishes*", like the master! A desire of subduing the world - for a slave who must submit to the sword slashes of the master any moment! The real wish of the slave would be to cut the master into two pieces with the same sword. A Philosopher who is 'a slave master' himself cannot

comprehend the real and clandestine yearnings of the slave's heart.

Hegel lacks awareness about class. Therefore, any matter such a person deliberates on the relations prevalent between hostile classes in society will be off track - such as the relations between the master and workers, women and men, prosperity and poverty, or any other.

> **Hegel**: "No individual will rest satisfied with a conquest that fails to secure the conscious acknowledgement of other men. Hence, there is a struggle for both power and recognition."

This was a statement Hegel made in the context of the master and slaves! A slave fights the master to establish his own power and recognition – to fulfill these two wishes! The words uttered devoid of awareness that a slave fights for his freedom and emancipation are decidedly characterized by the ignorance and arrogance of being a master. There might be instances where misled slave may also utter such ignorant words. Regardless of who utters such words, even a slave, words of this Nature will defend the position of only the master.

> **Hegel**: "In this struggle some will take greater risks than their competitors; those who risk the least will become the slaves or bondsmen."

Competition between the master and the slave! The slave and the master are competitors! When a slave escapes from the clutches of the master and runs away into the woods, Hegel would interpret the escape as an act of competition of the slave with the master, not as an attempt for freedom. Hegel can find the slave's competition only in his escape, nowhere else.

In the struggle of competition between the master and slave, now, witness the heroism of the master!

> **Hegel**: "...those who risk the least will become the slaves or bondsmen of those who face death by risking their lives. In order to preserve his life the slave submits to the master."

A person who wages his life even defying death and stands his ground is the master! And the person who surrenders to the master to save his own life is the slave! In this manner, one human being becomes 'the slave'! And, another human being becomes the master out

of his chivalry! What wisdom! How mis-adventurous one should be to speak like this! No other Philosopher until this time defined the master and slave relation with such sense of master hood.

As restitution, this Philosopher also made a few statements against the master hood. People who would like to believe him will believe.

> **Hegel:** "The slave is forced to work, whereas the master can enjoy leisure."

Those who wish to believe that Hegel was earnestly critical of the master may believe so! I will not. After those words, Hegel says the following:

> "The man who risks his life and becomes the first master breaks the bonds of Nature and starts the process that will incorporate mind into it."

The master, risking his life, broke the shackles of Nature first! In that process, he acquired knowledge. Should this idea be understood as the following? A master, when he was not yet a master, embarked on an adventurous task of breaking the shackles of Nature. If this was true, indeed, the slave was also not a slave at that time. Just as an individual human being shows the same level of courage for the natural resources, all the other human beings also do the same, won't they? Then, won't all the human beings are chivalrous? Or should we interpret these words differently that a person embarks on an adventurous task only after becoming a master? If the master is so heroic, why does he enslave hundreds of slaves for his benefit, and employs the whip lashing overseers all around him? Did he climb the trees himself making the slaves stand afar? Did he dig the mines himself? If anyone argues that today's master risked his own life and committed valorous acts, such argument is devoid of any wisdom. Such an argument should be given a different name.

It is said that the portion in 'The Phenomenology' that discusses the master-slave relation will be of great interest to the Marxists! There are no details available how the Marxists immersed Hegel in their praises.

It is also said that Hegel's wisdom is immeasurable and there will not be another intellectual ever. In the foreword

written to his book 'The phenomenology of mind' Hegel reportedly said that 'mind only' was real.

The entire Philosophy of Hegel revolves around the mind. This mind is the universal mind! Like the first letter of the word God is always written in Capital, in the English translation of Hegel, the first letter of the word 'Idea' is also given in capital. Probably in the German original, Hegel wrote this word 'Idea' like this. The Hegelian Idea was godly! That was the reason why he wrote the word like that.

The older Philosophers such as Democritus already preached Materialism. The intellectual Hegel who was born a few hundreds of years later clung on to 'the Idea' and 'the mind' and ruled the entire field of Philosophy!

There are many inconsistencies in the axioms ascribed to Hegel in the essays that glorified Hegel. Some of these axioms are quite escapist. See the following as a sample:

> "One knows that these antitheses have only a relative validity; that that which is recognized now as true has also its latent false side which will later manifest itself, just as that which is now regarded as false has also its true side by virtue of which it could previously be regarded as true." (Engels in 'Ludwig Feuerbach and the end of classical German Philosophy', page 363.)

What appears to be true today may not be true; likewise, what appears to be untrue may not be untrue either – this is the meaning of this dictum. The sufferers in this society will like this dictum. Then, let us assume that the system transformed into a good society and in that society everyone has to perform labour equally. If a uniform rule is applied to all, it will be a good society. But let us assume further that in the society transformed there exist some people who do not like to be equal and perform labour. The Hegelian dictum, 'what is truth today may not be the truth of tomorrow and what is untruth today may be the truth of tomorrow' will be quite handy for these people to believe that today's truth is untruthful. While this dictum is appreciated by the sufferers in one way, it is liked by the idlers in a different way.

Let us consider a principle

that 'all must work; one must live out of one's labor.' A principle such as this will apply to any one person, and in any society uniformly.

A Philosopher ought to point out the faults of a society in which he is a part to the extent that he can understand. 'There are beggars before our eyes; they have no food; this is not good,' can't the Philosophers say this? A refined preaching of this kind from a Philosopher will be equivalent to opposing poverty. One ought to grasp things about the society in which one is living in, and state the same pointedly. The workers of the present society may be fascinated by the dictum that 'what appears to be the truth today may be untruth But, tomorrow in a good society, the same dictum will work in favor of the idlers.

The idlers will be fascinated by the dictum that 'what appears to be the truth now is not true.' The Philosophers who propose such tenets may be innocent. But this dictum is evasive in the sense that it eludes the truth.

It is evident from the essays on Hegel that Hegel appreciated many aspects of the society in which he lived in his writings. He praised the regime of his king. According to him, 'the passage of God is the state'. Competition between states is necessary, he thought. As State is necessary, wars between states is necessary, he felt. One may say wrong things on certain issues. In such cases, we may sympathetically under-stand that the person did not have proper understanding. But, how can a person who has a little good heart and intellect defend a heinous act such as 'war' regardless of to which era he belonged?

What is war? Human beings slaughtering human beings. People of any era can understand this. The class consciousness is not necessary to understand this. What a great wise man ought to preach? 'Wars are demeaning. The civilized human beings do not need wars. All the conflicts must be solved without resorting to wars. Self-protection is necessary. However, one human being should not compel another to fight for self-protection,' could he not have said this much? Are wars necessary? Hegel advocates that the soldiers should not be recruited by force! Why should

a human being serve as a soldier when recruited by the greed of higher wages, or the lure of liquor, even if not by force? To die! Only the one who cannot find employment elsewhere will be prepared to die. Who are the wars for - the soldier or the master of the soldier? Did not the great wise man know such a small thing? Dictums and dictums! Who will benefit out of the dictums? The soldier or the master?

Since Marx and Engels respected this Philosopher immensely, I was a little hopeful that somewhere and something will be there for me to learn from him. As we can't see more than this however much we may have hope. Let us consider one more issue regarding Hegel, and be content with it. In the coming chapter, we will consider a dictum of Hegel against which there was lot of criticism. He took lot of trouble in answering the criticism. ★

28. "All that real is rational! All that rational is real !"

The critiques consider this as the most famous quote of Hegel. We can find this quote in the foreword of Hegel's German book '*Elements of the Philosophy of Right*' written in 1820.

Those who live in a class society and are familiar with the class system will be aghast initially to read 'what is real is rational.' Agitated, they will ask next, 'Who is this guy who uttered these stupid words?'

'Real' means the factual situation in the real lives. What are the factual things in our lives? The riches and the poverty, the luxuries of the rich, the addictions of all, wars, unemployment of the workers, beggary, thefts, death sentences, murders, suicides – and many more such as these! Are these realities rational? Is there a fitting cause (rational) for the society to be like this? As many questions arise against this dictum, one becomes furious.

However, an outlook to consider anything with a logical and thoughtful perspective will help you think about this dictum and help you cool down gradually. Why does an established reality in a country perpetuate in a specific form? Is there rational

(a cause) underlying every reality? Many such questions should and would occur.

In a country such as England where Capitalist system has reached its peak, how can there still be the kings and queens, even today? Why is the reality like this in this country? How the working class of this country is still enduring the monarchy and its extravagance? Is there a reason underlying this reality for it to be like this? Or, does the reality perpetuate like this without a cause? What is that cause then?

There is no distinction between the throne of the kings and the cushioned seats of the Capitalist-Presidents. These two sections fought each other at a time when they were not aware that they both 'belonged to the same class of exploiters. But after the realization dawned upon them that they both belonged to the same class of Masters, the landlord and Capitalist sections compromised with each other, and began to share the positions of power. The working class, on the other hand, continues to remain in a state of enthralling itself reading the amorous affairs of the rulers but not yet acquired the intelligence of grasping the tricks of the laws framed by the masters.

The ruling classes live in peace and prosperity dividing among themselves the heaps of 'the surplus value' and the 'surplus labor' snatched from the working class. This exploitation is the reality perpetuating in every country. Is there not a reason for the reality to be perpetuating in this form? Does the reality exist in this form without a reason? – Certainly not, there is a reason underlying this reality. The exploiting classes are committed to protecting this reality. The working class fails to embark on the task of shaking up the reality, being not aware of the facts related to the surplus labor and the surplus value, even today. The ruling classes in any country will neither disturb the perpetuating reality themselves nor will allow any others to do so. The reality stays undisturbed only because the major portion of the working class continues to remain in ignorance, and because the entire population continues to remain submissive to that reality. Wherever there is any form of reality, it will have some reason.

If the people change the

reality and form a new reality, the new reality will have a new reason. To cause the change is the new reason. Therefore, there is nothing wrong in saying 'what is real is rational'; it is really real.

The meaning of the word 'rational' is not 'righteous'. If the intended meaning were 'what is real is righteous,' the monarchy would have been seen as 'righteous' and the interpretation of the word would have been erroneous. But, the meaning of the term 'rational' is not 'righteous'. It simply means that there is rationality, and there is a reason. Can there be a condition without a reason? Can there be a situation without a reason? The word 'reality' intrinsically contains an appropriate reason underlying the reality.

There is nothing wrong also in the second statement 'What is rational is real.' A rational element will be factual or real. Many issues and relations in the society are rational. That means that they have a reason; that they become 'realities.' The relations between the parents and the children are rational. They are real. All the problems are rational. They are real. The death is rational and is real.

The axiom is applicable not only to the aspects of society but also to the aspects of Nature. In Nature, rationality and reality are always blended. After understanding the axiom in this manner, we will really begin to appreciate it.

After the release of Hegel's book containing this axiom, the Prussian king was quite thankful to Hegel. This appreciation was because the king's administration interpreted the axiom as 'the governance is rational.' The real meaning and what the king saw were different. In fact, any governance is a rational one. The governance exists or will exist only as long as the support of the people exists.

The meaning of Hegel, however, was not what we have reasoned. The real meaning Hegel intended should have been communicated explicitly along with the axiom. However, this did not happen. The axiom as it surfaced out of the book, exasperated at least some people. Questions and criticisms swamped Hegel, 'Are autocracy of the monarchy, and the atrocities of the police rational? Hegel had to struggle hard to answer the criticism. 'I did not mean that I did not mean this,' Hegel had

to resort to evasive explanations. Had the proposer of the axiom given a correct answer, questions of the critics would not have stood their ground. However, this did not happen.

Hegel should have replied this way: "When I said 'rational', I did not mean 'righteous'. I did not define the reality with a meaning of only righteousness or impropriety. I defined the reality as 'rational'. That means, 'a real thing' contains 'rationality' or 'a cause'. Can any one of you say that the reality can be formed without a reason and can perpetuate? Or can anyone of you say that 'rational' means 'righteousness'? No one can say so. The reality of the society takes a form in a way the people of the society shape that form. Do not say that 'the people do not have weapons to change the society.' The police and the soldiers are a part of the people and the population. The weapons are all in their hands. If the people understand the faults in the reality of their life, if they do not need that reality, and if they can acquire the power to change the reality, then, they can change the reality. If they do not change the reality, there is a reason also underlying that fact. Perhaps they do not understand the necessity of that change. Or, they may not know the path to the change. These are the reasons. The reality perpetuates because of these reasons. Is there any act without a reason? I simply said that the reality is as the people are. I only said that the 'reality' has a reason. I did not say 'whether that is righteous or wrongful." In this fashion, had the proposer of the axiom explained, the critics would have remained silent.

Hegel, however, did not give such an explanation. Because the reasons forming his thoughts were different. The reason was similar to the three earlier Laws. The proposer of the axiom attempted to repeat the same Laws. However, this attempt could not satisfy the critics.

The following was what Hegel said in the preface to his German book Philosophy of Right:

> "What is rational is real; and what is real is rational. Upon this conviction stand not Philosophy only but even every unsophisticated consciousness. From it also proceeds the view now under

contemplation that the spiritual universe is the natural."

From Engels, we can understand what Hegel opined about the axiom. Engels wrote a few paragraphs on the axiom. He attempted to explain the axiom the way he understood it. The axiom rejoiced the monarchy but enraged the liberals. This was because the axiom contained a quality to gladden the regime.

Engels explains this situation in his essay as follows:

> "No philosophical proposition has earned more gratitude from narrow-minded governments and wrath from equally narrow-minded liberals than Hegel's famous statement: 'All that is real is rational; and all that is rational is real'. That was tangibly a sanctification of things that be, a philosophical benediction bestowed upon despotism, police government, Star Chamber, proceedings and censorship That is how Frederick William III and how his subjects understood it". (Ludwig Feurbach and ……', page- 338, in Marx and Engels, Selected Works-3)

If the government understood the axiom as the benediction, a fistful of liberals opposing the regime too realize the axiom defends the regime. That is why the liberals were angry with the axiom. The proposer of the axiom should have elaborated the actual meaning of the axiom in the same book where he proposed the axiom. It did not happen so. Hegel's writing is typically incomprehensible, therefore the confusion!

From Engels' critique of the axiom, we can discern a few details. We can deduce the real meaning Hegel intended for the axiom. We will also realize that Engels was supportive of the intended meaning of Hegel.

> Engels: "…according to Hegel certainly not everything that exists is also real, without further qualification. For Hegel the attribute of reality belongs only to that which at the same time is necessary: "In the course of its development reality proves to be necessity." (page-338).

'What is necessary for society becomes the reality in the society,' this is the meaning of the above statement. If we interpret the axiom in this way, will it also not mean the following? When slavery really

existed, does it not mean that 'the slavery existed because it was necessary for the society! The monarchy exists because the monarchy is necessary for the society!' – Don't we get this meaning? This is a good question. We have to consider this question in detail.

In the primitive societies, following a tribal war, when the tribe that won the battle permits the vanquished to stay alive even as 'slaves' instead of killing them, this would be a development for the vanquished. We consider this as the beginning of classes. That means, the beginning of slavery was a development fit for those times and necessary for those people who were defeated. However, if this situation continued to stay like this for thousands of years, for whom the continuing situation was necessary? For which class this situation was necessary? Perpetuation of slavery for thousands of years was not a necessity of slaves. It was necessary only for the slave masters.

'The slave class could not rid of slavery for many thousands of years. The barbarity of the slave masters consolidated the savagery for thousands of years to protect their own interests.' An explanation of this kind would be an appropriate reason.

Instead, if we offer an alternative explanation as the following, 'The slavery existed as a reality for thousands of years because it was necessary for the society,' the explanation will be utterly wrong.

Hegel, however, intended the second meaning; not the first one. We may deduce that 'the slavery perpetuated because it was necessary.' In that case, we will be defending the heinous acts of the slave masters – the vicious attacks on the slaves using their dogs, severing the limbs of the slaves, pouring the boiling tar on the scalps of the slaves, and all such inhuman acts. We will end up praising the smartness of the slave masters, 'Indeed, all these actions were necessary in those times. If the absconding slave was not terrorized, he would not toil, would he? Was it not the noble need of the day?'

Likewise, we will have to glorify and applaud the monarchies thus, 'Indeed, how

necessary were these systems in those days!' And worship them. If the people of those times endured the autocratic rulers and the suffering for thousands of years - hanging from the gallows, impaled on the stakes, with severed limbs, and decapitated heads, if they endured such atrocities for thousands of years, it was not because the people needed these brutalities. It was their helplessness. The helplessness was the reality of the day. The reality of that society was not the need of the people of that day.

In today's capitalist system, the needs of the exploiters are not ending in a few days. The needs from the system are forever. Should the system continue like this forever because Capitalists need it that way? This system is not necessary for the working classes. If Capitalist system vanishes on a single day, all people can live happily by performing labours. The fact that the Capitalist system is still perpetuating implies that the society needs it; but because the wisdom of the people is dim! The people tolerate something that is not necessary. Why so? This is due to the ignorance devoid of the class consciousness. There is a reason also underlying the ignorance. As long as there is rationality (justification), reality will perpetuate regardless of how unnecessary is the reality.

In Engel's explanation of Hegel's axiom, we will encounter the principle of 'development' as follows:

> "…in the course of development, all that was previously real becomes unreal, loses its necessity, its right of existence, its rationality." This is dialectics, according to Engels. He further says, "Thus the Hegelian proposition turns into its opposite through Hegelian Dialectics itself: All that is real in the sphere of human history becomes irrational in the process of time, is therefore irrational but its very destination, is tainted beforehand with irrationality…" (page-338). This is how it goes on.

We may assume that reality exists to satisfy a need. When the old need vanishes, and a new need emerges, the old reality transforms into a new

reality. It means that a new reason substituted the old reason. When a reason changes according to the changed need, how is that equivalent to Hegel's axiom becoming self-negating? The proposition that 'there is a reason according to the need' is as correct in the second context as it is in the first.

From Engels' interpretation of Hegel's axiom, it appears that the essence of all the three previous Laws of Hegel has taken a form of the fourth axiom.

> Engels: "...the Hegelian proposition turns into its opposite through Hegelian dialectics itself." (page 338)

Having said this, Engels describes this as a revolutionary path.

'Truth, the cognition of which is the business of Philosophy,' saying this Engels adds, "In Hegel's view, truth means, all that exists deserves to perish". That means nothing is complete; nothing has an end! Everything is develop-ment. Development, eternal development!

> "Just as knowledge is unable to reach a complete conclusion in a perfect, ideal condition of humanity, so is history unable to do so; a perfect society, a perfect 'State', are things which can only exist in imagination. On the contrary all successive historical systems are only transitory stages in the endless course of development of human society from the lower to the higher. ...It (each stage) must give way to a higher stage which will also in its truth decay and perish....this dialectical Philosophy dissolves all conceptions of final absolute truth and of absolute states of humanity corresponding to it." (page 339).

This is how it goes on and on.

All the sentences and paragraphs are all alike! Engels was not explaining 'this is what Hegel intended to say.' If Engels contradicted with Hegel anywhere, it would have been evident. There was no contradiction like that anywhere. That means, Engels completely agrees with Hegel's assumptions; that there won't be a perfect society. Eternal development with diverse defects! For those who cherish communism in their hearts, this is the development that shakes

up the hearts! No one ever explained what would be the Nature of the development after relations of equality have been established in the society. They only keep chanting of *'development!', 'Development!'* - never ceasing development. And, they insist that this is dialectics. All Engels did in his critique was to glorify Hegel.

> Engels: "It (dialectical Philosophy) has, of course, also a conservative side: it recognizes that definite stages of knowledge and society are justified for their time and circumstances; but only so far. The conservation of this mode of outlook is relative; its revolutionary character is absolute—the only absolute dialectical Philosophy admits." (pages: 339-340)

We do not say that Engels was not aware of the limitations of the Hegelian Philosophy. Engels adored Hegel since Hegel professed 'development.' We can see a few sentences of Engels in a letter he wrote to a friend called Lange.

> Engels: "The absurdities of detail in Hegel's Philosophy of Nature I grant you of course readily enough, but his real Philosophy of Nature is to be found in the second part of his **Logic**....I am of course no longer a Hegelian, but, I still have a great feeling of piety and devotion towards the colossal old chap" (Engels to Friedrich Albert Lange, dt. 29-3-1865.)

Even without reading this letter, we can sense the admiration of Engels for Hegel. There are, however, a few questions on what Engels said here. How can one, who was able to follow real logic in explaining some aspects be stupid and ridiculous while talking other aspects of Nature? – There is room for this question. To be just, perhaps it is possible that one may be aware of a few matters correctly, but may be unaware of other issues so correctly!

The elements proposed in the Hegelian logic with 'great' proficiency are the three Laws that we read previously. And, should we consider the ridiculous aspects? Is there nothing funny in the three Laws? However, it appears that such funny elements are also present at other places! How else to understand this? ★

29. Philosophy, good to have it, but much better not to have it!

Those who wrote on Hegel make strenuous efforts to elaborate Hegel. Intermittently, they praise Hegel wholeheartedly. This glorification is what we will see in this small chapter.

*** "Hegel commented upon the philosophical significance of each form of matter."**

If the comments are only philosophical, and not scientific, what is its use for the society? The Philosophers brag about whatever fancies them.

*** "Hegel probed the soul as if the soul naturally existed in the physical world."**

Hegel glorified soul perhaps imagining that the soul existed somewhere. Didn't I say that the folks of Philosophy brag about anything that fancies them?

*** "To follow the guidance of the inner self is morality,' says Hegel."**

What if the inner self gives false guidance? My inner self tells me not to touch the philosophical writings, and not to permit the philosophical sayings fall on my ears. But, when Lenin admonished Anatoly Lunacharsky that without knowing dialectics one cannot be a Marxist, I was dismayed that Lenin admonished me. Now, with Hegel's support, I can talk back to Lenin, 'Look Lenin! I am really a Marxist. My soul tells me that philosophies are not necessary. And Hegel asserts that following one's inner self is morality. Tell me what is my fault?'—I will ask Lenin.

But, I guess, Lenin may not agree. 'You are following Hegel, not your inner self,' he would say.

'Well, perhaps, but should I not follow Hegel?'

Lenin would advance another point. 'When you do not like Hegel, why should you follow him? One must take good from any Philosopher and reject bad. To follow the inner self is not applicable in all the contexts. Our inner selves are formed depending on the societal conditions. Will you follow such an inner self indiscriminately?' he would admonish.

'But, Hegel did not mention that one should consider the context,' I would say.

'Indeed, he didn't. Should we take everything literally? Should we not think on our won?' Lenin reprimands me again.

I enjoy Lenin's scolding, but the problem is with the philosophies!

'Alas! Ought I to like these philosophies then?' I would wail.

'Not all of them, a few! Some good ones. Can't you understand good and bad?' he would scold me again.

'Alright, Lenin! I shall do so. Then, am I a Marxist?'

Lenin would smile and attend to a different job. May be the job of scolding someone else.

*** "God is not different from Nature,' says Hegel."**

Does this mean that God is a part of Nature? Why call something 'God' that is not different? Because no one questions a Philosopher!

*** A few Hegelians define the Philosophy of Hegel as 'rationalism'. 'Hegel believed that he could provide an apt description of the rational composition of the universe,' they say.**

The phraseology of Hegelian rational Philosophy consists of words such as the universal spirit, absolute spirit, eternal spirit, absolute Idea, supreme thought and the like! Some of the Hegel's followers reportedly fail to understand whether Hegel was a believer or a non-believer! How clever are those Hegel's followers!

*** "In Hegel's perspective, nature, and the society are the forms of the absolute Idea."**

Does this mean that the absolute Idea assumes these forms? Nature assumes one form, and the society a different form! In other words, the absolute Idea is nothing but matter! Does not the matter exist in different forms?

*** "The deliberations of Hegel's work 'Logic' can be abridged. The shortest description about anything is that 'it exists".**

Those elements that cannot be defined are the ones that need not be defined! We have no choice but to abandon those elements. I would stand first in such abandoning! No one can beat me in this.

*** "Hegel rejected the traditional Logic and brought to the fore his logic."**

What is Hegel's logic? Perpetual development! Did he consider that his logic too

should develop perpetually without stalling?

*** "Amidst of all of the entire logical material, only the Hegelian method alone stands out as the beginning."**

If this is the beginning material, there will be an opportunity for mending and development. We can accept this if it is the 'beginning.'

*** "With Hegel, ends Philosophy."**

It means that there is nothing to say! Then, how is the development to happen? Will not the Law of development of the Hegelian Philosophy apply to the doctrine?

*** 'None among the previous or the later philosophers equals Hegel. Hegel alone surpasses all of them."**

Is that so? Hegel surpassing the previous Philosophers is of course development. But, if any one says that no one after him will surpass him – will there be no wise person more advanced than Hegel? Didn't Marx say that the upside down Idealist doctrines of Hegel should be turned straight to make them into a Materialist Philosophy? Doesn't this mean that Marx becomes a wiser Philosopher than Hegel? Why brag that there will not be a wiser Philosopher after Hegel? It appears that the flatterers did not understand what the Hegelian principles say!

*** "If you tread into the gigantic dialectic mansion of Hegel, you will find abundant riches of wisdom."**

When we are not able to climb the steps outside the mansion, how can we tread into the mansion? What use are the riches of wisdom - if we can find some gold reserves, we can build walls out of it. If Hegel were endowed with the rich wisdom of realizing how harmful the flattery can be, he would have hung his head in shame amid this flood of flattery,.

*** "No entity existing in the universe has an existence beyond the soul."**

Do not invest your time to crack the meaning of this sentence. If you have time to spare, play the board game with cowries.

*** "Hegel described his Philosophy as 'the mental image of God."**

Does he expect us to learn from that image?

***A Hegelian explains the difference between Hegel and the other Philosophers, and the supreme intellect of Hegel as follows: Systems which other Philosophers elaborate would perish because those Philosophers advocate over coming of contradictions. If contradictions are overcome, the world history comes to an end. But, world history ought to continue. Whereas Hegel talks about endless contradictions. This means a single Philosopher accomplished the objective which the entire humanity ought to accomplish."**

If you work hard to understand these words, the meaning appears to be that 'the contradictions should remain unresolved.' If the contradictions are resolved, the history of the human beings and the history of the world will come to an end!

This is what the Philosophy comes to in the end. We must decide whether the contradictions must stay or go! If we come to an understanding, will the events transpire according to our resolution? This is wasteful! Stop reading, restore the book to its place on the shelf, and go to a movie if you have money.

*** "Until Hegel, Philosophy remained tight in the arms of the religion. Hegel perfected the dialectics."**

Even after perfecting, the dialectics remains in the tight arms of the religion. How can something perfect develop further?

Before reading the books of Philosophy, the word 'dialectics' appeared to me as the moon in the sky. After equating dialectics with the moon, my attention will not turn to the sky even if there glows the full moon. I feel like, 'we will see tomorrow.' The moon comes and goes as per his schedule not concerned if one is watching or not. Is there something to lose for the moon if no one is watching? The losers are the people who do not watch. Sure, there must be a few good words in the dialectics. However, the Hegelian cult and the flattery of develop-ment make one feel sick killing even the common sense. No, we don't need all this! Let us read Marx's 'Capital' again. Let us remember the wickedness of the exploiting classes again. Let us learn how to wage class struggle – thus; the mind runs towards the other side. In each and every page of 'Capital', we will realize that this is the only way to bring about 'development'.

30. Correct Materialism

The earliest Materialism forgot why it started off in the beginning and kept staring at the creator. It gradually passed through many stages and abandoned the creator slowly after self-criticism.

Materialism, however, doesn't mean just considering that 'there exists no God.' That will not be enough. That simple outlook cannot become a Materialist perspective. In addition to that, one should be aware of some more issues related to Nature. We are readily aware of some issues that must be known. And, the issues that are not yet understood must be explored further. We have to discuss these issues. These issues are in the form of axioms, questions, and doubts that make an appearance in the philosophical writings.

The Axiom of Nicholap, a religious believer:

"Outside of this visible world , there exists an invisible world. Only the religious faith, not the scientific discipline, can find this invisible world".

Alright, Nicholap! You found the invisible world, didn't you? Tell us about it. 'Only ignorance, not wisdom, can find the invisible world,' you affirm. Until now, the science disciplines, not the religion, revealed the phenomena of Nature, didn't they? Tell us at least one single instance when the religion, not science, unraveled the knowledge of Nature!

*** While debating with a philosopher, Emperor Napoleon asked the philosopher, 'Why do you not talk about the creator?'**

'The creator does not concern me,' replied the Philosopher. How elegantly the Philosopher revealed that the creator is irrelevant in acquiring knowledge!

*** 'How much space does the universe occupy?'**

Let us imagine that the universe assumes the shape of an egg. The entire universe is within the egg. From anywhere to anywhere within the egg, there will be no beginning or an end. The 'egg world' is marvelous. Isn't it all empty outside the egg world? How far and up to what extent does this emptiness extend? How to measure this extension? Can we measure the extension?

Why bother to measure the emptiness? In the emptiness, there cannot be any solid materials. If there exist at least two materials in the emptiness, regardless of how far-flung they are, regardless of how much emptiness separates them, the distance between the two materials can be calculated using some scientific measure, instead of a rope. But, in the vastness, how can we measure the distance from any one place to any other place? Even if there exists one material, up to where can we measure from this single material? If only our landlord knew that the expanse surrounding 'the egg universe' is unoccupied, he would set out immediately taking a pack of measuring tapes and accompanied by the farm hands. After returning, he will disclose to us with certainty how many acres the vastness exists in each direction. Then, we will know all about it.

*** 'How does one acquire knowledge?'**

'If the parents have knowledge, the children too will acquire it. How will the parents have the knowledge?'

Should this question need an answer? - If the parents of the parents have the knowledge. When the children wonder seeing the rain, and if the parents tell them - 'the water on the surface evaporates and comes back as rain,' – then, it would be knowledge. But, if they ascribe this phenomenon to the 'God of the wind' or 'God of the rain', that will be the end of wisdom. While educating the children with facts, we may use the context of miracles for fun, but the children should also learn how to view miracles critically. If we inject only the miracles into the heads of the children, even if they grow into becoming scientists, they will sway between rationality and superstition, and incline towards irrationality when facing a problem. Do you know what the first step towards knowledge is?

*** 'The cause and effect relationship'**

When a beggar comes to the front door, placing a fistful of rice in his bag, the mother would say to her children – 'These people do not go to school. They do not work. They do not toil. They beg like this.' She will not tell the children, 'they do not have even a yard of land. They

live under some tree or a shadow. All the lands are under the control of the landlords.' How can she say so when she doesn't know the facts herself? The imagination of the children of the rich families is filled with a notion that the poor are 'lazy and do not go to school.'

When another beggar brings a bull dressed with bells to the front yard and makes the bull prostrate, 'This is not a bull, he is Lord Nandeeshwar. This is our culture.' - The children are indoctrinated! Why Lord Nandeeshwar is prostrating in front of us? No one raises the doubt.

In Nature, or in the society, at every step, we face the cause and effect relations. Why are there beggars? There is a reason. Why is there a coolie (wage labourer)? There is a reason. Why is there a king? There is a reason. A human life that cannot see the reasons is the same as that of an animal.

*** 'The philosophers interpret the cause and effect relationship as follows: 'The *drugvishayam* (phenomenon) that causes another *drugvishayam* (phenomenon) is the cause.'**

Have you understood this? They make the knowledge sound like *Vedanta* by means of language. They consider this mystification essential. They think their reputation will be at stake, if they tell things in a simple way.

*** How does a human being acquire character?**

Character means a set of ideas. All the ideas collectively make the character. What ideas does an infant have? The things one learns while growing are ideas. The concepts that one forms from the relations of labour, family relations, and other social relations perpetrating between human beings are the human ideas and human Nature. Nature is the school from where the human being gets knowledge. The society is the teacher in that school.

*** 'The experiment shows the truth'**

'Truth' is not something that one can prove by talking. One can prove the truth only by logic, tests, and experiments.

*** 'The relative truth is the absolute truth'**

The absolute truth (the eternal truth) exists at all times. 'The matter has no end. The human

being is an integral part of Nature. The universe is one. The earth is round.' Statements such as these are absolute (eternal) facts.

A fact that is evident only when compared with something else is the 'relative' fact. 'This is the tallest tree.' All the other trees there must be shorter than this tree. The tallness of the specific tree is a fact only when compared. 'That landlord is a good person,' as compared to the other landlords. This is a relative truth. A landlord being a good person cannot be an absolute truth. Therefore, the truths are two types.

*** 'Nature and the society must be examined by their intrinsic factors.'**

External factors do not make Nature. External reasons do not cause the problems of the society. Therefore, the examination of any element should consider the intrinsic factors only.

*** 'Heat, light, magnetic impulse, chemical reaction, life, and consciousness – all these elements are the forms of motion. Motion has no end.'**

There can be motion only when there is matter. Motion cannot have an end unless the matter has an end.

*** 'Everything is uncertain.'**

Only to the aspects related to Nature, this is an 'absolute' truth. For the society, this is not.

*** 'Contradictions are eternal.'**

This applies to Nature alone, not to the society.

*** 'Rationality is the keynote of the materialist thought.'**

Indeed, one should agree with this statement.

*** 'Death after birth is a qualitative new change. The duration of life is the process of change,'**

According to the principle of quantity and quality, if death is a new quality, it should be of an 'advanced' level; and 'development'. How can death be an advanced level? How can it be development? We need to debate this aspect. Does this mean that the earth will become empty.

*** 'The world is not a collection of finished things; it is a combination of links, processes, and relations.'**

Is not the seed a 'unique product' whose making is complete and finished? When a tree attains its height and stops growing any further, is not it's

making complete? Every finished thing ages and dies. The same consequence befalls the seed. The same event befalls the ant babies. It is indeed correct to say that there is motion in any specific thing until the thing ended. But, is it logical to say that 'for any element, the making is not complete'? If the making of a grass plant does not stop at one level, will the plant grow into a grass tree in a few years as the qualities of the plant changing progressively? After that, what other new property? Will not an ant stop to remain an ant, and the grass plant a grass plant? Are these not the questions that one must discuss?

*** 'Humans from the monkeys.'**

If the making of the human beings doesn't pause here, after a few million years, will the human beings grow wings? Will human beings become living things of a different kind? What happens after another round of a million years? We will leave this problem to the scientists, not to the Philosophers.

*** 'There is no final phase for knowledge.'**

If we understand that the earth is globular, not flat, is this not the final phase for that aspect of knowledge? When we understand that Oxygen and Hydrogen should blend in a specific ratio to make water – is this not the final phase for that aspect of knowledge? When 5 is added to 4 to make 9 – is this not the final phase for that equation? 'Knowledge' consists of many individual elements. Knowledge is not a 'single' homogeneous entity. Every individual component of knowledge should reach its logical final phase. The knowledge of the Sun will have its completion. The question is whether we have already reached that final phase. In every physical element, the integral components are a part of the same element. When we understand the individual components and the relation between the components, can't we infer the complete knowledge?

*** 'There are no perfect conditions.'**

Who is this insane fellow?

*** 'Everything is born of the other things, and gives birth to other things.'**

This is indeed good. We should agree.

*** 'The extrinsic and intrinsic**

factors should unite to cause a change.'

We have to agree to this proposition too.

The egg + heat = the chick

(The intrinsic factor + the extrinsic factor)

The exploitative system + workers' struggle = Workers' liberation

*** 'Iron, not gold, is rusted.'**

Rusting is an intrinsic quality of the material. The rusting cannot be inferior and the converse superior. The needs of the human society are more intense for iron than gold. Gold is a wasteful material, or its needs are too small.

*** 'The consciousness exists only in the living beings.'**

The hunger, thirst, sleep, and the fear of death are natural stimuli (responses); all the living beings experience them. The social consciousness induced by the relations of labour exist only in the human beings.

*** 'A human being should be considered as an integral member of the society, not separate individual entity.'**

Every human being is a member of the society. The king and a pauper are also members. When seen as 'members', both the king and the pauper appear to be equals. However, there are many differences in the membership. We should be able to see beyond. We should see which person belongs to which class and within a given class to which sub-class/group

*** 'Generality and uniqueness.'**

In a mango grove, there are a hundred trees. All the trees belong to the same variety. All the trees bear the same kind of mangos. This is the general quality (a quality all of them have). However, among the trees, no two trees will share the same dimensions. The shape and health of each tree are unique to that specific tree. The fruits also may differ in a marginal way from tree to tree. Each tree has its uniqueness. Likewise, among a million people, the general properties of all the people are the same. But, every person is unique in form, voice, and other qualities. It is possible to identify any one person among a million. To say a 'human being' is a general quality. 'A specific' human being is a unique quality. Within a population, a specific individual contains general and unique qualities. While examining, we will

have to consider the general characteristic on some occasions, and the unique qualities on other occasions.

Thus, we will have to consider many issues. We will have to examine the matters related to 'time and space' later. ★

31. Space and Time: Are they matters? Do they exist or not?

Are space and time matters? Do these elements exist? In Philosophy, these are the questions that make it big for a debate! In this wrangling, the points of view of the Idealists and Materialists differ. And, the opinions of neither of the disciplines are consistent or clear.

While some propose that space and time are matter, others disagree. It would take at least one hundred pages to expound these deranged arguments. It is a waste of space. We cannot weigh each of these arguments. Based on the random reading, and our own logical reasoning, we have to tell whether or not space and time exist.

A 'farmland' is a space. It lies on the surface of the earth. Since the earth is a matter, a layer on the surface of the earth, the farmland, is also matter. The space that assumes the shape of the farmland has only two dimensions - the length and the width. These two measures collectively make the 'area' of the farmland. Likewise, a brick also is matter. The brick, however, contains a third dimension 'the height' in addition to the length and width. If we consider only the width and length of the brick, we will understand only the area the brick occupies on the surface of the earth. But, if we also take the height of the brick into consideration, then we will understand how much space the brick occupies on the surface of the earth and above that surface. All this space will make the 'volume' of the brick.

In a similar fashion, the volume that the globular earth occupies can be measured depending on the dimensions of the earth.

We stand on the earth, clutching to the uppermost layer of the earth. While we stand on the surface of the earth, where does the earth stand? Earth does not stand on any other surface. Earth revolves independently like a small round marble in a large space. The mathematics teacher knows how to measure the volume of the globular earth. Let us assume that the volume of earth is 100 cubic kilometers. That means that the earth occupies that much of space. It also means that earth in its shape consisting of certain dimensions of length, width, height, and globularity occupies this much of space.

How do we know that earth occupies so much of space? Did we measure the space before earth occupied that space? What do we measure, the empty space or the planet earth? We measure the planet earth. Using the special dimensions of this matter, we measure the volume of the matter, not the volume of the empty space. Let us assume that the earth does not exist in that empty space. What remains there is only the emptiness. Surrounding this emptiness is more emptiness in all directions. If we have to measure a volume of 100 cubic kilometers in this emptiness, how can we do this? We will have to take a certain dimension of length, a certain dimension of width, and a certain dimension of height in this emptiness. How to draw lines in the emptiness to serve as landmarks? The lines should exactly measure 100 cubic kilometers in that emptiness in the form of the earth or any other form. Will it be possible to define boundaries in the emptiness that 'a certain quantum of area remains with those boundaries?' Not possible. We cannot discern any small area or a specific division in that empty space distinctly. That means when some matter exists in a gigantic emptiness, depending on the dimensions of the matter, only after measuring the dimensions of the matter, can we say how much space is 'that space.' We cannot measure an empty space if there is no matter in it.

Let us assume that in an empty space there exists the planet earth and at a distance, at a different location, the Sun.

We can measure the distance between these two matters. We can as well measure the distance between the earth and other stars; because the stars exist there. In contrast, if only the planet earth exists there and there is no other matter, to where will we measure the distance from earth? When two matters exist, the distance between the matters can be understood. But how can we understand the total amount of space surrounding the two matter?

We are on the earth. What lies under our feet is a 'space'. This space is a certain matter; a matter called 'the earth'. We can measure the lengths and widths on this matter. Digging into the earth, we can also measure its depths. All the measurements have to happen about the 'matter' alone, within the confines of the matter. Since the planets are matter, they too are space. We can also measure them. But how to measure an empty space that contains no solid material?

Regardless of how much abundance of space surrounds the earth, we cannot grow crops in this emptiness. We cannot build houses; lay roads. Can we call the emptiness space? An emptiness should be called an emptiness, how can it be called space? What do we understand from this? Space can be referred to only as 'a place where a matter exists'. The space where the earth exists must be referred to as 'the earth space'. When the earth moves from this location, that space has changed. Since earth moves constantly, it is not possible to define any space as 'the earth space'. Regardless of the location of the earth, the dimensions of the space that the planet occupies are constant.

To refer to the space encircling the earth, we can say, 'from the earth, in a certain direction up to 100 yards,' or 'in a different direction up to 150 yards,' and so on. To refer to any empty space anywhere, we can only measure the distance from some matter. We cannot measure the emptiness without reference to some matter.

That means, 'space' is an area lying on a given matter or the location occupied by the matter. An entity not related to the matter is only emptiness,

not space.

However, is there some gas in the emptiness? The scientists claim so. 'Nature does not tolerate emptiness,' they say. Meaning, even in an entity that appears to be empty, there exists something. Good for us. All this will be the universe collectively. That gas will solidify to make planets. Then, we can grow crops there; and grow a lot many berry plants.

Now, let us leave the mess of space alone and go after the muddle of time.

About 'time':

We can see the land with eyes. We can feel the land; we can stand on it; sit on it. The surface of the land exists really; therefore it is matter.

Time, however, is not matter. We cannot see the time with eyes. Cannot touch it. Therefore, time is not matter. It is a perception. However, there are reasons underlying the perception.

While Sun rays fall on the earth, we know it is 'the day time'. Depending on the differences in the sun rays, we can understand the times of morning, afternoon, or evening. When the rays of the sun completely disappear, and the darkness engulfs the earth, it would be the night time. Even in the night, depending on the position of the stars, we can understand the phases of the night.

We can understand the difference between the daytime and the night time because there exists the sun in the sky and the rays of the sun fall on the earth. That means, the existence of two matters called the sun rays and the earth, forms the basis for the imagination of the time. Without the matters 'the sun' and 'the earth', how can there be a consciousness of time that 'this is a day or this is a night'? Only when these matters exist, we can understand the day and night. If there exists only one matter, the time cannot transpire. When the rays of sun fall on the earth, it will be 'the sunrise'. The dawn of the sun.

It is true that the formation of the day and night is due to these two matters, but without these two matters too, can there not be time? Indeed, we face this question and we should.

The first point, however, is that the time is not matter. We

breathe. Let us assume that it takes one second to inhale and exhale the air. To breathe twice, it would take a time of two seconds. And, to breathe ten times, it would take a time of 10 seconds. That means, regardless of the day or night, it would take a few seconds of time to breathe. For the time to pass, however, there must be a human being or an animal first. For either of them to exist, there must be the earth even before that. For the earth to exist and the living things to form on the earth, there must be the sun before all this. That means, only when there is the earth, and when there are the living beings on the earth, only then, we can understand the passage of time.

What if we don't sense the time? What if there is no one to sense the time? Does not the time keep moving? Since we are habituated for the passage of the time, we are conditioned by this assumption. We are presently in the year of 2014. How did we get the count of the years? We started counting the years from the instance of the birth of Jesus Christ. Since that time, the earth has completed revolving around the sun 2013 times, and it still continues to revolve. We, therefore count it as the completion of 2013 revolutions. What if the sun and the earth do not exist? Or if the earth doesn't revolve? How can we sense the passage of the time?

There is no sun. No earth. No matter of any kind. There are no human beings to breathe. No plants to germinate. No day and night. No breezes. Then, with respect to what event would the time pass?

The motion of time is only when there is matter, and there are changes in the matter. When the plant grows, when the sun emerges in the horizon, when the human beings breathe, that motion makes the time to move. That means the time doesn't exist on its own. The time is related to the matter. The time is related to the happenings related to the matter. 'The sunrise' is a happening. It rained before the sunrise. To understand 'before', we need the sense of time. 'The rain stopped in the afternoon'. 'The afternoon' is the measure of time. "There was a clap of thunder at midnight.' 'Midnight'

defines the time of the event. Time is an entity that defines the happening of the event, as they happened or as they will happen. Time is a condition of the events.

When we say, 'This boy is ten years old,' to account for the ten years, for the time to happen, there must be the sun, the earth, the human beings, and all the other elements. The earth should have revolved around the sun ten times. That means, the measuring of the time is related to the events of the matter. The matters do rot or dry up as they exist. A change of any kind takes place only in the matter. Since time is not matter, a change is not possible in the time. All the changes happen only in the matters. The time necessary for these changes to happen is the motion of time. What is the basis for measuring the time if there is no matter, and there are no changes in the matter?

Let us assume that there is not even a single matter in Nature. All is emptiness. All is dark. But, somewhere there exists a good clock. The clock can show the details of years. If the clock keeps moving, after some time, can we not understand how many years have passed? This is a good question. However, this cannot happen in this manner. Where will be the year clock lie when it is ready? We cannot hang the clock from a branch of a tree as there are no trees. There is only emptiness. How can a clock exist in the emptiness? Some power, the gravitational power or some other kind of power, will be needed to make the clock work. The clock, therefore, cannot work.

Nevertheless, won't time move, in the absence of the clock? I too feel so. Even if the time moves, it will not have an effect on any event. The effect is possible only when there is matter.

Between the space and time, space is a matter but not the time. To refer to the space, we will have to associate it with 'here or there'. And to refer to the time, with 'now or then'. For both space and time, the point of reference is only the matter.

Where there is 'space', there also exists the influence of time. When did the space form? How long ago? Still how long the space will exist? What kind

of changes are going to happen in the space? Thus, the motion of time is dependent on the changes in the matter. There are no space and time without the matter.

Albert Einstein: "When the matter ends, space and time will also end." (cited in the Telugu version of 'Dialectical Materialism and Historical Materialism,' Prajasakti publications, page 71). This is to say that without matter, there is no question of space and time.

A human being walking on some space (on the land) can walk back to the place from where he or she has started. But, that person cannot walk back in time. When one moves forward in space and then turns back, it is same as returning in the space but not returning in the time that has passed.

Some of the debates of the previous times regarding space and time are good, while some others are crazy. Some of the doctrines profess that space and time both are matters, some others argue that they are not, and that they are related or not related to other materials, and so on.

The matter in the universe is infinite (there is no end). Space is also infinite. The time associated with the matter is also infinite.

Let us name the correct Materialism as 'the dialectical Materialism'

Proper understanding of the phenomena related to Nature and the society amounts to understanding from the perspective of dialectics. The primary way to do this is to understand anything based on to (1) the time and (2) the context.

For instance, Can we ask, 'why Jesus Christ or the Buddha did not talk about exploitation of labor?' No. We can't. This is because discovery of 'the surplus value' is not possible unless the phenomena of 'the wage system' and 'commodity production' came into existence and are in vogue to some extent. In the earlier systems, there was no possibility of calculating 'the surplus value.' Therefore, people before Christ's era or the eras previous to Capitalist system couldn't have calculated the surplus value. That means they couldn't have grasped the exploitation of labor. Given those conditions, leveling criticism against the

people of the previous eras that they failed to question exploitation of labour is wrong. However, there were widespread slavery and abject poverty during those periods. Whether those people responded to these afflictions or not may be considered. The people of any times who responded to the sufferings of the human being with kindness are great people.

A few philosophical quotes:

'In the entire universe, there is nothing other than the matter.'

'Space and time cannot be separated from the matter.'

'The empty space and the infinite time, both are facts.' (There are two different doctrines that there is emptiness and there is no emptiness).

'Nature does not tolerate the emptiness.'

'Space and time cannot be separated from each other.'

'Aristotle argues that 'outside the matter, there are no extant qualitative principles and relations.'

For the scholars of Philosophy, the debates and the language of this kind give intoxication to the same extent as the believers get it from the religious discourses. ★

32. The time-pass philosophies of *Pullayyas* and *Yellayyas* !

[The names *Pullayyas* and *Yellayyas* are sarcastically used in Telugu to indicate uninformed, ordinary, rural folks who dare to speak anything and everything irrespective of the fact whether they know the subject matter or not. Similar to Tom, Dick and Harry in English.]

Sample the following to see how many contorted debates are rampant in the name of 'Philosophy'! All these are found in books on Philosophy.

*** 'Is the 'form' of an object separated from the object?'**

This type of questions began because there are intellectuals who profess, still continue to do so, that the real universe exists elsewhere and the images of this universe enshroud the inhabitants of this world. These intellectuals will make great Philosophers, won't they? These types of questions

are due to their teachings. Should meaningless teachings lead to meaningless questions? To borrow a Telugu saying '*If the speaker is eccentric, should not the hearer be sensible?*'

'The real tree lies elsewhere; only its image is here' - should we consider a rubbish conjecture such as this as if there is some great meaning in it? Should we award such affectionate pet names of calling one camp 'Idealists' and the other camp 'Materialists'? To be frank, calling the former camp as 'the people gone mad' and the latter camp as 'the people who have gone mad,' would suit them the best. Those who refuse to indulge in these polemics, turn their heads away, and not look at that side at all; those, I would consider the real Materialists. Isn't this the obsession of Philosophy? Around here, there are people who can correct those who err; like Feuerbach correcting Hegel, Marx correcting Feuerbach, and Lenin admonishing Berkley and Hume – and if someone can reform me, I will be delighted. I will rectify my errors and refine myself. But, they must also tell me what to call those who indulge in debates with the mad people. Henceforth, I too shall use the same description.

*** 'Is the shadow an object or not?'**

This is a question! The Materialists profess that 'matter is the primordial thing and all of Nature is matter.' In retaliation, these mad folks ask whether 'the shadow too is matter.' Their intention is to extract an answer that 'the shadow is not matter' and to prove that 'something not matter can be visible.'

When the rays of the sun or that of a lamp fall on an object and as a consequence, do not fall beneath the object, the space where the rays fail to fall is the shadow. The shadow cannot stand on its own independently like a tree but must fall invariably on a matter such as the surface of a piece of land, the wall, or some other such thing. Pointing at the shaded area, answer the questioner thus, 'the dark region, the shadow, is matter.' Must we respond to every question that these insane people keep asking?

*** 'Does this world really exist? Or does it exist only in our mind?'**

This is a question! Tell the person who asks this question to 'eat all the food in mind' when hungry; never will he ask this question again.

*** 'There is money in someone's pocket. The existence of money is factual. Factual means, there exists some matter. The next day morning, there is no money in the pocket. It is a fact of that time. The fact is that the pocket is empty. Is this fact also matter? The facts are always matters, aren't they?'**

You mad fellow! Get Lost!

*** 'An adolescent boy sports a thin beard and thin mustache. Do we call him a person 'with a beard' or a person 'without a beard?'**

Neither. Is it necessary that the boy should be described one way or the other? At the time of engagement, the bride will tell! If he is married, ask the wife.

*** 'Is the mind an object?'**

Some say 'yes,' and others 'no'! Have the people who say 'the mind is matter' ever seen the mind? Can anyone point at 'the mind' like pointing at an eye or the nose?

*** 'Is the bitter taste of the bitter-gourd inside the fruit or outside?'**

In Philosophy no one asked this question until now; I thought it quite apt to include this question. Therefore, I invented this question. We also have to discover where ghee lies in the ghee-ridge gourd. I only invented this question also.

*** 'Are there time and space?'**

Landlords will be able to tell whether space exists or not; will be able to tell whether time exists or not. We cannot understand the interpretation of the Philosophers that 'Space and time are the generalized forms of the existence of the matter'. We, therefore, will have to resort to the landlords and the workers regarding this problem.

*** 'There is no beginning and end to the soul.'**

'There is neither beginning nor end to the matter and it does not perish,' the Materialists claim. Aping this statement, the other kind of Philosophers invented 'the soul.' They say, 'The soul exists in the person. There is no beginning or end to the soul. The soul does not perish even if the body does. The soul moves eternally.' This is a wish to remain on the earth eternally!

*** 'The state is a great establishment formed by the society.'**

Indeed the state is a great establishment but formed by the exploiting classes.

*** 'The Barley seed germinated into a plant. The quantity has transformed into a new quality.'**

By understanding this fact, can we grow the Barley crop more efficiently?

*** The examples for 'the negation principle' are as follows: After the marriage, the changed status is the negation of the previous status! It is development! Becoming a father is negation and development! To become a grandfather is the third negation!**

According to this principle, eating food when hungry is the negation of hunger and develop-ment for dinner! When a sitting person stands, it is development for the chair and negation of the standing person! Instead, when a standing person sits, it is the negation of the chair and development for the person! For every living thing every moment there are negations and developments!

*** 'There is motion in every matter. The matter keeps changing.'**

'In support of this principle they say, 'A living thing exists as itself and as other-self '

We can invent other examples like this to suit our imagination. Subba Rao is a living thing. He breathes continuously. There will be continuous changes in his body. Subba Rao being Subba Rao in the first moment will transform partly into Apparao in the second moment still continuing to be Subba Rao. In the third second, he will change from Appa Rao into Joga Rao and becomes Subba Rao partly and partly Joga Rao. In this manner, while being himself, he keeps transforming into many other Raos. This phenomenon applies not only to Subba Rao but to all of us! Don't we keep breathing?

*** 'Existing and not existing in the same space.'**

This is a great principle! 'As the earth is always in motion, every object on the earth, a tree or a mountain, exists at one place and also at a different place. The objects keep moving.'

What is this? An object stuck in one place on the earth will

remain there not leaving that place. Even if a tree entrenched to a spot moves through space along with the earth, where its location has changed?

*** 'The perishing of one object is its replacement by another object similar to the first one.'**

This is an erratic extrapolation of the process of production necessary for the daily sustenance of the human society to the philosophical domain in an insane manner.

*** 'It appears that the sun is revolving around the earth, but this is not true.'**

They cite these examples related to the natural phenomena with an intention to extrapolate these principles to the matters of the society. 'Capitalist system appears to be democratic, but this is not true,' they say. They attempt to draw a parallel between every event of Nature and that of the society. Although we know that it would be wrong to state that 'the sun revolves around the earth,' we cannot correct this wrong assumption. This assumption is permanent. But, if we realize that democracy in Capitalist system is unrealistic, we can change this system. Why draw such comparisons?

*** 'Friction between two stones creates heat.'**

Citing this natural phenomenon, they say 'the national struggle generates heat against the imperialist system.' Everywhere they attempt to draw parallels between Nature and the society!

*** 'The length of the tail of a dog is five inches. Is there a reason underlying the fact that the tail is precisely this long?'**

Is this a point worth discussing? Those who are opposed to the cause-and-effect relationship believe that there could be events without a cause and try to find such events. Is the length of the dog tail this long? Certainly. We may not know the reasons. However, the length of the dog's tail may have been determined by one factor or the other intrinsic to the body of the dog. This character cannot be one without cause.

*** When we say 'Socrates was a citizen of Athens,' we do not bother regarding other details of this person. Was he a Jew? A Roman? What was his age? Of what complexion? – We**

repudiate all these specifications.

What kind of knowledge is this? Are they insane? 'Socrates belongs to which city?' if someone asks this question, what would be the reply? Would they say, 'he lives in Athens.' Would anyone reply that 'Socrates, a Roman, who is short and stout, sporting a red beard, married and having children, and of forty years of age lives in Athens'? Would renaming Philosophy as 'the science of hocus-pocus' would have suited it the best?

*** 'I am within myself.'**

Can an ordinary human being understand this statement? Is there a difference between this and the *Vedanti*c theology of God? 'Know thyself,' says *Vedanta*. Whereas, this Philosophy proclaims 'I am in myself.' The extension of this doctrine would be, 'You are in yourself, he is in himself, and she is in herself,' so on! We cannot understand this statement since there is nothing in it to understand. The people who make such statements do not do so having a command on the topic. They are greedy of being recognized as scholars of Philosophy and want to gain fame associated with this kind of sayings flavored with religious beliefs and *Vedanta*. They are least bothered about the real life matters. They make such statements with an intention to become axiomatic scholars.

*** 'Is there Sun in the sky?' The answer would be a yes or no; an unambiguous and a single reply. In a context such as this, the answers are affirmative or dissenting. However, talking of a wagon rolling in rapid motion down the road, if anyone asks whether 'the wagon exists in a specific location at a specific moment,' then, the answer can be 'a yes,' or 'a no,' both. There is not a single answer.'**

This is the philosophical wisdom! This is the way to enrich wisdom! This type of examples lay the way only to 'insanity.' There is many a gibberish talk like this! When half of the hair is fallen, there is a query whether or not it is a baldhead! If you call it a bald head, the answer can be a no. If you deny that it is a bald head, then, the answer can be a yes. There cannot be one answer to this kind of questions. A 'no' for an

'yes', and an 'yes' for a 'no'. These are the examples all the Philosophers collectively managed to discover! Their worry regarding the baldhead stoops down to this level.

*** 'The flora and fauna are beautiful. We look at them only superficially. The bark of the trees, the plume, the feathers and the scales of the animals- we look only at these things. We fail to see the inner soul.'**

If you enter the body, will we see the soul? A tree-soul inside the tree, and an animal-soul inside the animal! When we cut the brinjal to make a dish, we find only the seeds, where is the eggplant-soul? Are the seeds the soul?

*** 'Truth is concrete, not abstract.'**

That means the truth is definite, not ambiguous. An example offered by a Philosopher in support of this proposition: Looking at a glass of water, it is not enough to consider that it is 'a glass of water.' To think only so little of the object is not knowing the object thoroughly. To know all the facts about the glass including about its making, its history, and its relations to the rest of the world is the knowledge about the glass! We should examine the glass as we examine an atom or a subatomic particle. The Philosopher, however, did not specify if we must do all this every time we drink water. So long the glass is clean and contains good water, not alcohol, is it not enough?

*** 'Every living being must die.'**

Does Tom, Dick or Harry know this? Do we need the Philosophers to tell us this? The person who made this statement may be a famous Philosopher, but he is also akin to some Tom, Dick or Harry.

*** 'A person who does bad things always but did a good deed one time cannot be called a good person. Likewise, a person who does good deeds always but did a bad thing one time cannot be called a bad person. We should not look at a stray event, but take all the events into consideration.'**

First of all, there should be a clarity regarding the 'good' deed and a 'bad' deed. For these preachers, 'the slavery' cannot be an evil thing and 'the equality' a good thing. Therefore, we need to know what is good and what is bad. We, however, need not consider good and

bad from the perspectives of these Philosophers, but from that of our own realization. When a person who does bad things all the time, does a good deed once, we need not trust that person. He is a bad person in totality. In contrast, a person who does good deeds always commits a bad deed one time, his past virtues will not come to his rescue. We must ask 'what is wrong with this person?' 'If he has done such a bad deed now, was his previous behaviour only a pretension? If not pretentious, how can he commit such an evil act like this?' this kind of logic follows. Regardless of the good deed, the evil Nature of the person will not change. He must be considered as an evil person. When a good person commits an evil act, this would be surprising. This is an indication for his sliding into evil. We cannot trust that this person will not commit evil acts in future. His whole past will change. As with the bad person, we must be vigilant about the good guy also. We need not assume that as the evil legacy of the bad person would not change with a single good deed, a single evil act of a good person also would not change his good legacy.

We cannot draw a balance sheet in case of the human behavior whether the good or the bad component is larger. In a basket of fruits, one or a few rotten fruits will not make the basket spoilt. This principle is good enough for the evaluation of the quality of objects, but not for the estimation of human behavior. A person performing evil acts always is an evil person. A person who commits evil acts sporadically is also an evil person. A person cannot be a gentle soul because he committed an evil act only a few times. This is not the definition of a 'good person.' The evil act must feel really insignificant. And the person must be ashamed of this small act and be repentant. Therefore, we must have a clarity regarding 'the evil act' first.

*** This is one thought of Hegel regarding 'God.'**

'God will be god to the extent he realized himself. His self-knowledge is nothing but human being's knowledge about god. Human's knowledge is the knowledge that extends to self-knowledge of the human being about god.'

In the works of Philosophy, debates of this kind, meaningless and futile are abounding for those who are in need of passing the time.

These are the deliberations that the scholars indulge in after a sumptuous meal, strolling in the courtyard garden to digest the heavy meal, to avail the spare time, and by rallying innocent Toms, Dicks or Harrys who throng them in adoration! People of this kind pretend to be great intellectuals of Philosophy, but they are no different from the religious preachers. Regardless of deliberations such as this that last for years, their debates will not turn towards asking why 'poverty and prosperity' exist. The Suns, Moons, and the galaxies revolve around their debates effortlessly. They will not invite the toiling domestic attendants or the women of the household to these discussions or permit them to join these deliberations. They trust that these lowly souls cannot reach up to their intellectual heights. Who is benefitted by the philosophical debates regarding the soul? Can the life of a single beggar be transformed by these deliberations?

★

33. Does Marxism mean Hegelianism?

Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao paid extraordinary attention to Hegel, the Philosopher. Didn't Marx show great devotion to Hegel like a zealous disciple?

I don't mean that they have only appreciated Hegel's teachings without a criticism of any kind. Indeed they made criticism. However, these critiques remained flattened under the weight of the praises.

As far as Marx and Engels are concerned, their display of adoration and affection for a Philosophy that professed 'development' are quite understandable especially in those times.

We have witnessed serious attempts to achieve 'socialism' since the time of Lenin and the beginning of such attempts in Russia and China. It is, however, irrelevant to the present debate whether or not these attempts survived. Witnessing a revolution in theory and real practice are two different things. We have

indeed witnessed the beginning of the socialism. Marx and Engels, however, saw the beginning of the system only in their imagination and theory. For the people who have been flung far away and awaiting a revolution, any utterances of 'development' would appear essentially as the revolution for which they have been striving, won't they? This was the reason why Marx and Engels adored Hegel. It was the same reason why all the Marxists pay utmost attention to the Philosopher.

It is not enough to examine Hegel's Philosophy by calling it mysticism and a set of Laws of knowledge, as was done in the past. We must debate, again and again, the most important proposition of Hegel's Philosophy, namely, 'never ending development.' Only after evaluating the Philosophy as much as we can, only then, we can understand what should be taken and what should not be taken from Hegel.

In fact, Marx and Engels read Hegel and Feuerbach very early in their formative years. Consequently, they rectified their own Materialist perspective. Their writings that appeared since 1845 attempting to interpret history from the Materialist perspective turned into '*The German Ideology*.' After this, other than using a few expressions of Hegel in 'Capital' occasionally, Marx did not write anything more on Hegel. Nor did Engels write on Hegel specifically. Forty years later, after Marx's demise, Engels in his book 'the *Dialectics of Nature*' and in his essays and letters on Feuerbach made references to Hegel to some extent. Neither Marx nor Engels did refer to the Hegel's Philosophy more extensively than this. However, wherever they referred to Hegel, they showered praises on Hegel to the possible extent.

Lot of love which Marx and Engels have for Hegel seems to me as an enigma beyond comprehension since Hegel was a Philosopher who defined the slave-masters as those who fought valiantly risking their lives and the slaves as those who surrendered to save their lives.

> **Engels**: "It (Hegel's method) had not been subjected to criticism, not been overthrown; none of the opponents of the great dialectician had been able to make a breach in the

> proud edifice. It had been forgotten because the Hegelian school did not know how to apply it. Hence, it was first of all essential to carry through a thorough critique of the Hegelian method." (From Engels' review of Marx's 1859 work, '*A contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*', page-224)

Engels says that a thorough critique has not been undertaken and this must be done. Whenever there was an opportunity, Engels, however, only showered praises on the impermeable fort of dialectics but did not attempt at any critique.

Everyone will agree with Engels when he said,

> "Marx was and is the only one who could undertake the work of extracting from the Hegelian Logic the nucleus... and establishing the dialectical method, divested of its Idealist wrappings..." (page-224-225).

What Marx used in 'Capital' were the Logic and a few expressions of Hegel (to explain a few concepts). Logic is essential to explain any science. The use of a few Hegel's terms does not constitute the theoretical basis. The basis of Marx's knowledge is not made of these expressions. The foundation of Marxian knowledge is 'the theory of exploitation of labour' that Marx himself discovered and serving as the basis of his critique of the economic and political issues. In the absence of the knowledge of exploitation, can the use of a few terms of dialectics such as 'alienation, negation, quantitative, and qualitative' make it a theory? This is not something Engels did not know himself; or something with which he would disagree. I am of the opinion that Engels wrote like that without properly choosing the words.

In those days, there was an erroneous opinion that 'the Hegelian dialectics is the basis of Marx's theory,' and that 'Marxism means Hegelianism.' I do not say that Engel's perception falls under this category. But, to say that 'Marx made Hegel's dialectics as the foundation of his theory is likely to lead to some misunderstanding regarding the Marxian theory.

Dialectics existed since remote past. The concept was neither discovered by Hegel nor began with him. Hegel may have developed dialectics to

some extent. This fact must be duly acknowledged. But the importance Marx and Engels gave to Hegel was not adequately balanced. They equated Hegel and dialectics as one and the same. Indeed, to improvise Materialism, some more appropriate principles must be added.

The theoretical environment has been made to appear as if Hegel coined the term 'dialectical Materialism.' In those days, adversaries of Marx used to make sarcastic remarks such as 'Marxism is nothing but Hegelianism. Marx was saying something due to Hegel only.'

In response to the bourgeois remarks of such as 'The Hegelian dialectics is the basis of Marx,' Lenin responds with great indignation:

> "Here we have the stock method of accusing Marxism of Hegelian dialectics, an accusation that might be thought to have been worn threadbare enough by Marx's bourgeois critics. Unable to advance any fundamental argument against the doctrine, these gentlemen fastened on Marx's manner of expression and attacked the origin of the theory, thinking thereby to undermine its essence." *(What the "Friends of the People"* are how they fight the Social Democrats, page36. Moscow edition, 1970.)

As Lenin said, what Marx adapted from Hegel is only the 'manner of expression.' No one should consider that the manner of expression itself makes the foundation of the Marx's theory.

Marx's theory exposed the secret of exploitation of labour. Those people who can neither comprehend nor tolerate the theory that exposed exploitation of labour are capable of slandering. Even if Marx and Engels did not give great importance to Hegel, the heckling of the exploiters would not have stopped. They had their hatred. That hatred increased and led to false statement like 'Marxism is nothing but Hegelianism.' To some extent, our comrades are also responsible for this misrepresentation.

Neither Marx and Engels nor Lenin expressed any reservations regarding the essence of the Hegelian principles. They also did not write anything specifically on these Laws.

The views of Stalin and Mao on Dialectics can be seen briefly in their works. ★

34. Stalin on Dialectics

Stalin sets out defining dialectical Materialism as follows:

> "Dialectics comes from the Greek dialego, to discourse, to debate. In ancient times dialectics was the art of arriving at the truth by disclosing the contradictions in the argument of an opponent and overcoming these contradictions. There were Philosophers in ancient times who believed that the disclosure of contradictions in thought and the clash of opposite opinions was the best method of arriving at the truth." (From www.marxists.org)

Not only in the ancient times, but at any point of time, this is the way in which people discuss and debate. Pointing out the shortcomings in the argument of the opponent and rectifying the mistakes in one's own argument.—Only if these two things happen it becomes a debate.

> **Stalin:** "This dialectical method of thought, later extended to the phenomena of Nature, developed into the dialectical method of apprehending Nature, which regards the phenomena of Nature as being in constant movement and undergoing constant change, and the development of Nature as the result of the development of the contradictions in Nature, as the result of the interaction of opposed forces in Nature." (from www.marxists.org)

So far, Stalin speaks of the old Idealist dialectics. When the people indulging in a debate state that 'a seed germinates into a plant and an egg hatches into a chick,' they use the natural phenomena to illustrate their points of view. One cannot wage an argument without taking the support of the natural phenomena. Nevertheless, the old timers did not realize that 'Nature is the primordial basis of the thought.' Subsequently, Stalin illustrates 'the four principal features of the Marx's dialectical method.' Here I present those features briefly:

1. Phenomena in Nature exist not in isolation but connected with each other.

2. Nature is not static and unchanging. It is in a state of continuous movement and

change. Something is always disintegrating and dying away while something is arising and developing. Dialectics does not regard that something which seems to be durable and yet dying away. Dialectics considers only a thing that has arisen fresh and is developing as the principal element.

My comment on this issue: This issue is bound to lead to a completely erroneous conclusion unless there is sufficient explanation given with many appropriate illustrations. In the first place, in societal matters, a division based on 'the old and new' is absurd. Such a division may be appropriate to food items. One must be careful whether a food item is fresh or spoilt. With respect to matters related to society, one's perspective must be to ask whether the issues are 'good or bad', not whether they are 'old or new.' (In the case of phenomena of Nature, there are distinctions like old and new but not good and bad.)

In the exploiting societies, since the olden times, a multitude of addictions and anti-Nature practices have always been emerging fresh and prospering. Among the offences, new kinds of offences have been rising and thriving. The good aspects of the past perish falling prey to the bad conditions. To name a few mean deeds, a new practice of women renting out their wombs (surrogacy) has been flourishing. Various ways of abandoning old parents cruelly are developing. To consider 'everything arising/ developing' is great, and to fail to differentiate between good and bad amounts to developing mean deeds. In matters related to society the perspective, therefore, should be to differentiate between 'good and bad', not 'old and new.' To the society, there is nothing more treacherous than thinking in terms of perishing or developing of an aspect. Either in the societies based on exploitation of labour or in a socialist system where the people haven't yet developed the proper perspective, the bad prospers over the good. To consider development alone is great, and if this is what the good dialectics teaches us, then, there is no theory that can be more harmful than this.

3. Stalin's third point:

"The dialectical method holds that the process of development should be understood not as movement in a circle, not as a simple repetition of what has already occurred, but as an onward and upward movement, as a transition from an old qualitative state to a new qualitative state, as a development from the simple to the complex, from the lower to the higher:" (from www.marxists.org)

My comment: According to this 'principle of endless development,' there must be flaws in any development regardless of however developed the system may be! After that, the flaws may be allowed to lessen in a small way, but not completely. If a flaw is rectified completely, a fresh flaw must ensue immediately. Without flaws, how can there be development? If you solve a mathematical puzzle correctly in the first attempt itself, how can you revise it later? The rectification must be carried out only to a small extent, not fully, and the flaws must remain. The mathematical puzzle must not be solved forever. In other words, regardless of higher stage a society may have reached, there must remain intrinsic flaws in the society! This brand of dialectics improvises all the elements but keeps them faulty. This brand of dialectics doesn't have a way to eliminate the flaws. Fantastic indeed! It is indeed amazing to see that no scholar is aware that the concept of 'eternal development' is a laughing matter.

Now we have to examine the fourth point of Stalin.

4. "Dialectics holds that internal contradictions are inherent in all things and phenomena of Nature…The process of development from the lower to the higher takes place not as a harmonious unfolding of phenomena, but as a disclosure of the contradictions inherent in things and phenomena…" (from www.marxists.org)

These are the principles of Marxian dialectics which Stalin illustrated. Unlike Hegel who described these doctrines as 'Laws of Thought', the Marxian scholars call them 'Laws of Nature' – that is the only difference. In fact, one must highlight the aspect of contradiction first. The aspects

that emanate from the contradictions could be introduced subsequently. None of the scholars followed this order.

Stalin finally concludes:

"Further, if the world is in a state of constant movement and development, if the dying away of the old and the upgrowth of the new is a law of development, then it is clear that there can be no "immutable" social systems, no "eternal principles" of private property and exploitation, no "eternal ideas" of the sub-jugation of the peasant to the landlord, of the worker to Capitalist." (from www.marxists.org)

My comment: The communist revolutionaries desire the abolition of private property and exploitation of labour. The revolutionaries are reassured of 'the certainty of elimination of exploitation of labour' because the principles of dialectics profess the eternal development in terms of dying away of the old, and the emergence of the new. No one, however, raises the question, "won't the newly arising Communism too become old and eventually perish inevitably? Isn't 'the old dying away and the new emerging,' the principle of development? Isn't dialectics preaching eternal motion and eternal development? 'The peasant being subservient to the landlord and the worker to Capitalist cannot be an eternal truth' because dialectics dictates so. What would be the implication of this statement? Because of which fact will there be a change that the peasant need not be subservient to the landlord and the worker to Capitalist? Because dialectics assumes that the old perishes! What is the difference between the claim that palmistry that foresees the future and the claim that dialectics assumes change? How are the problems of peasants and workers solved? Will they be solved by means of their class struggle or because dialectics assumes that everything old vanishes? What do we see here? The class struggle goes to the second place and the Laws of dialectics occupy the first place.

What should be the factor for elimination of exploitation of labour? Should struggle of the working class be a factor or the Laws according to which motion takes place in the Nature and hence the society too

changes. If the exploitation can vanish due to dialectics, it would be very good and also very easy. We will not have the burden of reading 'Capital'. Superb, indeed! Even though class struggle is necessary and it becomes a reality, only due to the Laws of dialectics! Aren't Stalin's elucidations splendid?

Now, we will have to consider the views of Mao on the Laws of dialectics. Let us see how they look like!

★

35. Mao on Dialectics

While introducing the Laws of dialectics, Mao clarifies that he would reject two of the three Laws and accept only one, as follows:

> **Mao**: "Engels talked about the three categories, but as for me I don't believe in two of those categories. (The unity of opposites is the most basic law, the transformation of quality and quantity into one another is the unity of the opposites: quality and quantity, and the negation of the negation does not exist at all.) The juxtaposition, on the same level, of the transfor-mation of quality and quantity into one another, the negation of the negation, and the law of the unity of opposites is 'triplism', not monism. The most basic thing is the unity of opposites. The transformation of quality and quantity into one another is the unity of the opposites quality and quantity. There is no such thing as the negation of the negation. Affirmation, negation, affirmation, negation . . . in the develop-ment of things, every link in the chain of events is both affirmation and negation. Slave-holding society negated primitive society, but with reference to feudal society it constituted, in turn, the affirmation. Feudal society constituted the negation in relation to slave-holding society but it was in turn the affirmation with reference to capitalist society. Capitalist society was the negation in relation to feudal society, but it is, in turn, the affirmation in relation to socialist society." This discussion continues thus extensively. ('Talk on questions of Philosophy', August 18, 1964. From www.marxists.org).

The essence of what Mao said: Although Hegel originally

proposed three Laws, it is enough to talk about contradictions. All the other aspects will follow from that. The quantity and quality are mutually contradictory. Why is it necessary to define the contradictions as a Law and the other aspects separately? Where is the point of Negation of Negation in reality? Why is it necessary to divide negation as the third Law? All the Laws can blend into one – the contradictions. This is the essence of Mao's explanation.

According to Hegel, however, all that takes place from 'the contradictions to the negation' is 'a process'. In a seed, there are contradictions first. Therefore, there is a motion in the seed. A plethora of changes happens in the body and quantum of the seed, and the seed transforms into a plant. That plant is 'quality'. The disappearance of the seed is 'negation'. According to Hegel, until this point, it would be a process. Hegel divided the entire process into three phases or components. This division is appropriate because even if we blend all the phases into one single principle, that single principle must consist of the processes spanning from the contradictions to the negation. When depicting an issue, regardless of whether or not we define the constitutive components collectively or separately, the inference would be the same. Based on Mao's subsequent depictions, it is evident that he agrees with all the elements of Hegel's propositions. It is meaningless to criticize for dividing and discussing aspects separately. When we divide the individual components into distinct elements, we can describe each component in greater detail. The issues will become clearer. The real question here is not whether the proposition must consist of three separate Laws or only one. These two forms are one and the same. The real issue is to decide whether to agree with each of the Laws or not and if we must disregard any one of the Laws. This is the real question.

The meaning of the 'contradiction' doesn't become evident from Mao's description. He portrays 'contradiction' that lies between the quantity and quality. See Mao's words once

again.

'The unity of opposites is the most basic law, the transformation of quality and quantity into one another is the unity of the opposites: quality and quantity...' This means that the quantity and quality are mutually contradictory to each other! Should we understand that 'the seed' as the quantity, 'the plant' as quality and that there exists a contradiction between them, or should we presume that the seed itself consists of the quantity and quality and that a contradiction exists between these two elements? Clarity is lacking in Mao's words. We, therefore, cannot discuss this issue further.

Mao agrees with all the three Laws of Hegel. He agrees with the components quantity and quality, and he also agrees with the changes.

Hegel described the seed germinating into a plant leading to the disappearance of the seed as negation. This was the name he conferred on to that change. He called the disappearance of the plant as 'another' negation. While on the one hand agreeing to all these processes that lead to the transformation of the seed into a plant, why on the other hand Mao rejects the idea of 'negation of negation' we cannot understand. (See the earlier statements of Mao.)

When one element transforms into another, the element which disappeared has undergone 'negation' and the element which emerged has undergone 'affirmation' – this is Mao's explanation. When a seed is transformed into a plant, the seed has undergone 'negation' and the plant 'affirmation'. Mao expresses his objection as follows:

'Slave-holding society negated primitive society, but with reference to feudal society it constituted, in turn, the affirmation. Feudal society constituted the negation in relation to slave-holding society'.

According to this statement, the disappearance of the primitive society is negation, and the emergence of the slave society is affirmation. Later, when the feudal society replaces the slave society, what disappeared is negation and what appeared is affirmation. Mao implies that Hegel must use the terms negation and affirmation to define the changes. '*There is no*

such thing as the negation of the negation.' said Mao. He implies that Hegel 'must use these two terms (negation and affirmation) not those two terms (negation of the negation)'.

Mao, it seems, did not understand Hegel's intention in using the two specific terms. He doesn't appear to have attempted to understand this. In a change, when one element disappears, and another emerges, if we refer the first one as negation and the second one as affirmation, one would understand the change only to the extent it has happened. However, refering the change as the 'negation of negation' (to intend that the negating element will also be negated), implies that the phenomenon of negation would not stop with the negation of the first element only, but the second element can negate the third one, the fourth element can negate the third one, and so on and so forth. Thus the intended meaning of Hegel's Law of negation is that negations take place constantly.

Do Mao's terms 'negation' and 'affirmation' convey the meaning that negations take place constantly? No. Therefore, the terms should express the meaning that Hegel intended.

When I read Mao's statement that negation of negation does not exist, I was delighted initially that he rejected the Law of negations since I considered that it is an irrational Law from the beginning. Mao, however, did not reject the Law. He only insisted on the use of a different terminology but did not reject the principle. That means Mao agreed fully with the idea that there would be continuous development leading to perpetual changing of the society! This issue will become evident in the subsequent statements of Mao.

The primitive society would be replaced by the feudal society which in turn will be replaced by Capitalist society, that in turn by the socialist society - everyone describes the changes like mantras. No one would utter a word about what happens subsequent to communism. Nevertheless, the understanding of all the scholars is the same that after communism (that is, even after the formation of relations of equality), there would be continuous development in the society. Mao talks about it more elaborately than others.

None of the scholars attempts to use the least discretion and ask whether the dialectic postulation that 'the old perishes and the new emerges thus continuously changing the qualities,' is appropriate and whether there exists a distinction between Nature and society. They consistently equate both the aspects and blend them into one.

They consider the death of a human being as a replacement for an 'old element' and an event worthy of joy. Mao explains why he would consider death of a person as a matter of joy:

> "One thing destroys another, things emerge, develop, and are destroyed, everywhere is like this. If things are not destroyed by others, then they destroy themselves. Why should people die? Does the aristocracy die too? This is a natural law. Forests live longer than human beings, yet even they last only a few thousand years. If there were no such thing as death, that would be unbearable. If we could still see Confucius alive today, the earth wouldn't be able to hold so many people. I approve of Chuang-tzu's (4th century BC) approach. When his wife died, he banged on a basin and sang. When people die there should be parties to celebrate the victory of dialectics, to celebrate the destruction of the old. Socialism, too, will be eliminated, it wouldn't do if it were not eliminated, for then there would be no communism."

Didn't dialectics say that the old must be replaced? The human being perished exactly as dialectics said! If not for the directives of dialectics, wouldn't all those dead persons have been alive today? Could the earth bear the burden if all the people remained alive? Mao has lot of sympathy for the earth. Aren't the people who are alive today a burden to the earth? Then, why should the living people be alive?

'When people die there should be parties to celebrate the victory of dialectics..' says Mao. If dialectics represents a natural principle, where is the question of victory or defeat for dialectics? Does a phenomenon in Nature have victory sometimes and defeat some other times? If gravity is a natural phenomenon, will it work sometimes and fail

some other times? When the children playing on a wall miss the footing, will they fall to the earth sometimes and fly off into the sky some other times? The people must die for dialectics to be victorious, and if they fail to die, it would be a defeat for dialectics. Then, don't people die forever? And, would it be a defeat for dialectics if the people are alive?

When a person (a living being) is alive and stirring, all of the mass in the making of the person would have derived from the upper layers of the earth and the atmosphere. After the demise of the person, all this matter will return to the earth and the atmosphere. That means, the fluctuating numbers of human beings and the animals that the earth must bear, will not make a difference to the burden of the earth. Therefore, when the dear ones depart, we should mourn the departed instead of rejoicing the reduction of the burden of the earth and the victory of dialectics.

Mao mentioned that Chuvang Tzu celebrated the death of his wife by delightfully singing while playing a beat on a pot. Thus, Mao condoned the conduct of the husband! Can't we understand how defiled is this husband? I feel extremely happy that the wife escaped and secured liberation from the clutches of such a despicable husband. Death is inevitable. For a wife who cannot liberate herself while being alive, how fortunate she must be that 'the death' visited her sooner! Alas, the wife, however, did not have a dialectical luck to break into a rejoicing dance, singing gleefully and feasting when the husband would be dead tomorrow! I was quite sad for this misfortune of the wife. I was rejoicing on the one hand and sad on the other hand. Besides, I also felt ashamed for the way the revolutionaries have understood dialectics!

We have to shake-off all this embarrassment and move on to see what Mao says about socialism and communism.

> **Mao**: 'Socialism, too, will be eliminated, it wouldn't do if it were not eliminated, for then there would be no communism.'

Is socialism a phase that must be 'eliminated'? Socialism develops and stabilizes into communism. It is not to 'eliminate

socialism'. Socialism is the first phase of communism. It is the initial phase during which exploitative relations of labour' will begin to be eliminated. With the changes continuing, the socialist phase will transform into the communist phase. That means phase of socialism is not the one that must be 'eliminated' unlike a phase during which system of exploitation of labour is eliminated. The socialist phase is not a phase opposed to Communism. We must describe the socialist phase as one that 'transforms into communism' but not as one that will be 'eliminated or rejected'.

Mao talks about communism further as follows:

> "Communism will last for thousands and thousands of years. I don't believe that there will be no qualitative changes under communism, that it will not be divided into stages by qualitative changes! I don't believe it! Quantity changes into quality, and quality changes into quantity. I don't believe that it can remain qualitatively exactly the same, unchanging for millions of years! This is unthinkable in the light of dialectics. Then there is the principle, 'From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs'. Do you believe they can carry on for a million years with the same economics? Have you thought about it? If that were so, we wouldn't need economists, or in any case we could get along with just one textbook, and dialectics would be dead."

Each and every idea Mao expressed here is debatable. If discussed carefully, we will have to reject each idea.

'I don't believe that there will be no qualitative changes under communism' says Mao. This means that he believes that the Communism will continue to change! The communist revolutionaries should conform to the tenets of their theory when they express their opinions, but not according to their con7victions by way of such statements as, 'I believe this, I do not believe that'. This is not a context of believing or not believing in something. Our ideas and our convictions must be formed based on a theory and remain consistent with that theory.

> **Mao**: "I don't believe that communism will not be divided

into stages, and that there will be no qualitative changes. Lenin said that all things can be divided. He gave the atom as an example, and said that not only can the atom be divided, but the electron, too, can be divided. Formerly, however, it was held that it could not be divided.."

Whether it is an 'atom' or an 'electron', they are things related to Nature. What Lenin applied to an atom, Mao is extrapolating to the communism. It doesn't mean that in a system called 'communist society' there will not be any changes. When 'the old division of labour' totally transforms into 'an equal division of labour', it will be the transformation of one phase. When the production of 'the commodity' ceases, it will be the change of another phase. All the necessary changes will ensue thereafter. After a few changes ensued in phases, what will be the Nature of that system in the end? A question will certainly crop up on the proposition that every quality will change continuously leading to an unceasing development. There could be a few similarities between aspects related to Nature and society. But, would it make sense if one argues that whatever happens in Nature, the same thing happens in the quality of social relations in each and every aspect?

According to Marxism, 'Communism is a system wherein there won't exist hostile classes, antagonist contradictions and where relations of equality are consolidated.

The continuation of relations of equality is the quality of the communism. For the formation of such a quality and its continuation, we will have to change many old and faulty social relations completely. There has to be a final destination' for development.

If anyone says he won't 'believe' in such a transformation, he has to show a reason for his disbelief. Mao did indeed show a reason. Mao would believe in the dialectics which says that 'development will not cease and the old things change'. He would not agree that quality will stop at a certain point.

If the scholars who believe that development takes place constantly provided at least one example explaining the form development would take after

relations of equality have been established, this debate would come to an end. The scholars must give at least one example. The scholars must prove that in every development there will be flaws and such flaws will be unavoidable. Not necessarily only Mao, anyone can prove it.

'I don't believe that it can remain qualitatively exactly the same, unchanging for millions of years! This is unthinkable in the light of dialectics.' reiterated Mao, didn't he? (This dialectics has become a big headache!)

What is 'the light of dialectics'? Old being replaced by new. Continuous motion. Change after change. Will all this happen in Nature and society the same way? One may argue, 'didn't Hegel say so? Engels too said that! Yes, they did. So what? Should we obediently accept everything others have said? This should not be so. One should think independently and agree to a proposition only if convinced. The ideas accepted in this manner will not only be of others but also ours. Then, those ideas will become ours.

Let us consider the matters in the light of dialectics. In order to ensure eternal development, let us assume that development cannot be complete and that in every development there will be defects. Without defects, how can there be development? Development in what? In communism, according to Mao, there must be equality and also defects! These two aspects should go hand in hand!

What further development would be there if a new change takes place in the principle of 'each according to one's ability'? All the people, who work in Industries where machines are used, will have to report at the workplace according to a schedule and perform their duties. If the limits of the working hours are scheduled differently for different people, can this be an improved form of development? Should one person work for two hours and another for 12 hours, and should we consider this difference as 'working according to ability' and as a more improved form of development? All the people will have similar work schedule, discipline, and working conditions. Nevertheless, the individual abilities to work will be different even under identical conditions.

When ten people work on ten different sewing machines, won't there be differences in their individual performances? When ten people work on the computers, won't there be individual differences in their work? If ten different clinicians cater to patients under similar clinical conditions, won't there be differences in the caregiving? Similarly, in work done by means of machines under identical work conditions, there will be minor differences in the performance of the workers depending on their abilities. These differences, however, are insignificant. These differences are natural. Likewise, the consumption of the products with minor differences is also natural. A family can only use as much rice as per the needs of the family. The use of blankets, soaps, footwear will only be as much as per the needs of the family. Importantly, we should not consider that the culture of today will prevail to be the culture of tomorrow.

'Then there is the principle, 'From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs'. Do you believe they can carry on for a million years' asked Mao, didn't he?

He is implying that we cannot implement a principle such as this. Let us imagine that the people will evade work without working according to their abilities and out of greediness will grab more than what they need – let us imagine that the egalitarian system will change like this. This change will be 'a reversal of equality to the older system'. But, according to dialectics, change is always an improvised development moving forward, not backward. If the change moves in the reverse direction, how can such a change be conformed to dialectics? If dialectics does not dictate such a change, how can change like this be possible?

Well, let us consider such a change has taken place. If some people conduct themselves appropriately at the workplace and others, do not, what does it mean? This will be inequality. What should happen then? The change must move in the direction of equality. There must be criticism, counseling, warnings, and expulsion to deal with the misbehaving offenders depending on the context and

the people must direct the relations towards the destination of equality.

This is the struggle of the defenders of equality against the opponents of equality. When there is backtracking, there must be a compensatory advancement to counter the reversal and to reach the original ground. Whenever there is backtracking, what must ensue is to move forward.

'Do you think the communist order will remain without change for a million years?' Asked Mao, didn't he? According to Mao, what was the meaning of the 'change'? Moving forward or backward? If the change is 'backward', it would be possible to move forwards to the original position. But, if the change is 'forward', then, someone must imagine how such a phase will look like and explain it to others. They must first portray a social system characterized by equality in all social domains and then, define in which domain and in which direction development must proceed! Not only Mao, anyone can do this. I was incapable of explaining this, hence did not attempt to do so. Those who are competent in doing so, please explain!

We need to examine a few more things which Mao discussed. We will see them in the next chapter. ★

36. What does quality mean?

And, what does form mean?

According to the principles of dialectics, any new change, we must consider, like the one that has undergone progression, not regression. Since dialectics does not suggest regression, we will have to discuss how development-after-development takes place in society with regard to relations of equality.

Mao illustrates the concept of constant and continual development by assuming production of new objects:

"Lenin said that in the future, aeroplanes would be as numerous in the skies as flies, rushing hither and thither. Everywhere they will collide, and what will we do about it? How will we manoeuvre them? And if we do, will things be all that free? In Peking at present

there are 10,000 buses; in Tokyo there are 100,000 [vehicles] (or is it 800,000?), so there are more automobile accidents. We have fewer cars, and we also educate the drivers and the people, so there are few accidents. What will they do in Peking 10,000 years hence? Will there still be 10,000 buses? They may invent something new, so that they can dispense with these means of transport, so that men can fly, using some simple mechanical device, and fly right to any place, and land wherever they like. It won't do just to understand necessity, we must also transform things."

Mao discusses above the emergence of possible newer forms of transport for traveling in the future. We must consider this description together with what he discussed elsewhere previously regarding the changes in the form of objects. Mao offers the example of the changing form of objects to substantiate the proposition that the Communism will not remain with the same quality and that there will be qualitative changes in this society. Can we consider a change in the form of products as a change in the 'form' of the society or a change in the 'quality' of the society? The production of newer forms of products could happen in any branch of production. Let us assume that the people in the society will remain equals as before with reference to the labour process and the consumption or utilization of the goods produced. If the human relations remain unchanged after the advent of new products, we cannot consider the advent as a newer quality and development in quality. If the people develop vehicles superior to the airplanes and use them according to their needs, can this be a qualitative change?

This assumption implies that principles of dialectics are great as they express constant development and hence we should be obedient to the principles and in essence it amounts to surrendering to them. The question, 'does every aspect of Nature apply to society?' did not occur to any revolutionary. Everything in Nature is Matter while everything in society is related

to human relations. Every change that takes place in physical matter does not happen in the human relations in the same manner.

Mao believes that the principle of 'each according to the ability' and 'each according to the need' does not operate in Communism but the dialectical principle of 'continuous development' would operate precisely and constantly. We have previously seen that according to Mao the qualities of Communism will keep changing and it is not true that it does not change. 'If that were so, we wouldn't need economists, or in any case we could get along with just one textbook, and dialectics would be dead.' He said, didn't he?

It is okay if there is consciousness of establishing and continuing the principle of equality, namely 'each according to ability and 'each according to need'. What should we do if such a system falters? We will have to rectify the faltered system. No Economics than this is there for learning.

Economics is not a grand science beyond our comprehension. If one could start with the concept that 'money' means ' value of labor', and continues to understand what the terms 'wage, price, land rent, interest, and profit' mean, one could realize the secret of exploitation of labour, one can understand the means to eliminate exploitation of labour. Today, the exploiting class is aware of the way how to fix the prices of the commodities, pay the wages, and extract profit. The Economists of the Labouring class are aware of the concept of 'surplus value' and how to calculate it. If the same exploiting system and the same exchange value relations persist for the next one million years, no substantial and novel knowledge will add to Economics.

If we can manage to transform the production relations by abolishing the exploitation completely, then, we will not need any economic science other than measuring means of production and measuring the 'concrete labour' etc. The perpetrators of exploitation know what should be known, and the people who ought to eliminate exploitation know what should be known.

Only through the path of liberation of the working classes will the exploiting classes can find emancipation from their abominable parasitic life. The two rival classes, traveling down this path, will realize in greater detail how they both can unite in equality.

Nations will continue to live in peace and harmony only after forsaking their nationalities and coming to exist as different geographical locations of the earth. When we have acquired this minimalistic awareness, we have understood all about the science of economics. What we must hold constantly is the perspective of 'use value', not that of 'exchange value'! Specific kinds of labor and the specific use values produced by those specific labours are what we need to sustain equality forever. Although we need newer calculations and newer estimates for the new society, all these newer measures will depend on the calculations of the use values known already.

All the estimates of the use value are the measures by the weighing balance and by the measuring scale - the measures of weight, length, and width. How many kinds of means of production? How many producers who perform labour? Such are the estimates needed for making any product.

In the absence of money calculations, the estimates related to making of products and consuming of products become quite a simple matter. We can learn such calculations gradually.

Although Mao said quite casually that we can manage with a single printed book, this is the fact in reality. All we need is a 'book of tables', containing additions, subtractions and multiplications – not to 'manage', but to keep track of the accounts.

When the principle of 'each according to ability and 'each according to need' is implemented and such relations of production are consolidated in society, won't this mean the end of the Law of constant motion suggested by dialectics? Mao, therefore, was pained to conceive 'the end of dialectics'. That means, for those who believe that the society will remain flawed with limitations forever to sustain and perpetuate dialectics, the

consolidation of Communism will indeed be distressing that dialectics will cease to exist.

This approach reminds us of an anecdote of a hermit who places a curse on a poor man that the poor man should lose speech. Alarmed, the poor man begins to wail loudly 'Alas! Sir, do not condemn me. Do not put a curse on me.' The hermit shouts back 'I have placed a curse on you. I cannot take it back. Do not speak. Should my curse work or not?' Abusing the hermit, the cursed man leaves shouting and screaming loudly. The curse worked so effectively! That is, it did not work. Precisely, like the defunct dialectics following the consolidation of the Communism!

A principle, when formed out of logical inferences and is devoid of internal contradictions, will remain stable and eternal. If a principle reaches an end, one must conclude that the principle is not rational. When Communism is established, dialectics is likely to become non-functional! The Communism unable to consolidate itself and plagued eternally by a multitude of maladies will be benefited by paltry developments accrued by the mercy of dialectics!

What if the communist principle of 'each according to ability and 'each according to need' sustains and the dialectic doctrine of 'eternal motion' perishes? We should be delighted to see the consolidation of Communism – why should we lament thus, "Alas! without a qualitative change in Communism, dialectics will end!" Why does a contradiction arise between the qualities of Communism and the principle of dialectics? Should dialectics disappear when communism is established? Then, will dialectics be a rational doctrine? Should we aspire for the establishment of communism; or be content that dialectics should survive even if Communism vanishes? If there is a contradiction between the two what do the human beings need – Communism or eternal flaws?

So overjoyed was Mao with the principles of dialectics that the presumptive suggestion of the imminent end of the mankind gladdened him immensely. See how ecstatic was Mao regarding the end of mankind:

> " The life of dialectics is the continuous movement toward

opposites. Mankind will also finally meet its doom. When the theologians talk about doomsday, they are pessimistic and terrify people. We say the end of mankind is something which will produce something more advanced than mankind."

According to Mao, the end of mankind is certain. Because 'the life of dialectics is the continuous movement', isn't it? To sustain that life, the qualities of communism must keep changing. Never mind, even if the mankind ends! When science tells us that 'the mankind would end', we feel sad - not happy. When the theologians say that all human being will pass away why should we rejoice?

'When the theologians talk about doomsday, they are pessimistic and terrify people.' says Mao. Those who say that all will perish—will they say so to terrify others? Are not the theologians be scared of the doomsday themselves? Will not the doomsday pounce on them? Do they say that 'you will go and we will stay?'

While Mao is ecstatic about the end of the mankind as dialectics envisions, the theologians only attempt to scare people of the doomsday. I like the theologians in this regard. They have affection for the mankind. Importantly, they are sad that they will not exist themselves. When the theologians say the same thing as dialectics, why be critical of them?

Here also, we can recall a good anecdote. There was a mother-in-law, same as dialectics. She was hungry for authority. One morning, she left home to fetch water from the village pond. There, she saw a beggar. 'Have you been to my house to collect alms?' she asked the beggar.

'Yes, Madam. Your daughter-in-law shooed me away. She was busy.'

The mother-in-law got angry. 'Did she say so? Never mind her. Come with me.' The mother-in-law briskly walked back home with the pot of water.

The beggar who that morning meandered quite a distance aimlessly happily followed her. Mother-in-law went in inside the house, kept the pot at its place and came out.

'Mother! Please give me

alms. I am starving,' said the beggar.

'Go away. My arms are not free. Go away,' roared the mother-in-law angrily and turned back.

The beggar took a back and asked the mother-in-law, 'Mother! Your daughter-in-law already told me so. Then why did you ask me to come back?'

The mother-in-law flew into a rage. 'Who is she to say so? I have to say to anyone to come or to go. I am saying now. Get lost, Go to another lane!' And, she went in. Had she offered him a fistful of rice and then said this, the beggar would not have felt bad. It must be she, not the daughter-in-law, who can refuse alms to the beggar! That is the mother-in-law-ness!

Likewise, the doom of the mankind is for the Philosophers of dialectics to declare, not for theologians to ascertain! What is the difference between the mother-in-law and the disciples of dialectics?

If something more advanced replaces the mankind, what way will this substitution be beneficial to the mankind? That 'something advanced' perhaps will sport wings, wheels on the feet, horns, fangs, or all of them collectively! Perhaps, some other strange qualities! How will it be our concern what quality improvises the new race? How will that be 'advanced'? Every race has its unique qualities! Every race has its needs! What is necessary for the new race will form on the bodies of the new race. The race to emerge tomorrow will also be the living beings of the same Nature.

Among the different species in Nature, how can one species be superior and the other inferior? Is an elephant superior to an ant? Can the elephant build an anthill like an ant? Is a comparison between two different species of Nature justified? - Certainly not. Perhaps, a new race will emerge tomorrow in the place of the mankind. That new race, however, will not be superior not only to the mankind but also to the ant race.

Must the mankind perish, the rational people will be sad naturally; it is quite abnormal if anyone rejoices imagining the emergence of a new race.

The disciples of dialectics do not seem to have any rational sense.

We can narrate another anecdote around the wishful

thinking of dialectics, namely, 'something advanced than the mankind' will emerge in future. Any of the wonderful fantasies would suffice that promises the heaven after death and the comforts of the heaven. If you think properly, the fantasies of the heaven much better than the fantasies of dialectics. We reach the heaven with our own bodies. There we can roam around with our own bodies. We will be enjoying the comforts of the heavens ourselves. According to dialectics, it will not be us who will be that superior race. We will not see that superior race. However wonderful it might be, how will that race concern us?

Do the theologians convey the message of the doom of the mankind with pessimism? Will the message of destruction of mankind cause pain or joy to human beings? Isn't it natural that this message is communicated with a lot of melancholy?

And, how did Mao convey this message? 'We say the end of mankind is something which will produce something more advanced than mankind,' he assures! Who is this 'we'? Who else but the disciples of dialectics?

So far, we have examined dialectics with many examples. Regarding dialectics, I have come to the conclusion that two or three aspects of these principles appear proper. In Nature or society, all the elements are interconnected, and Matter keeps changing constantly – we can appreciate such propositions. It is, however, incorrect to propose that we can extrapolate every change in Nature to society. There is no more wisdom in dialectics except these two or three aspects.

The real knowledge the human society must acquire is that there still exists exploitation of labour and we should get rid of it. That all the ailments and all the problems are sustaining based on the exploitative relations!

We do not need dialectics as a solution for the problems of the human beings. We need not bear dialectics on our heads to this extent. What we must do is to learn about the 'surplus value'. To learn about 'the hostile classes'. Nothing else is more critical to the human society. The development of the human society will be driven by the working class consciousness, but not by dialectics. Regardless of how

well conversant we are with the Laws of dialectics, Socialism is not possible.

Mao alone referred to Communism while examining dialectics. Although his interpretations regarding the way dialectics will affect the Communism and transform its qualities are erroneous, except Mao, other leaders did not refer to Communism. Except for Mao, other leaders who glorified development-after-development did not ask 'what will be after Communism? Will Communism too change?'

Although Mao said he would not accept two principles' of dialectics, he accepted all of these principles. Quantity and quality, higher and lower levels, eternal motion, development after development, equating Nature with society with regard to the application of principles of dialectics – thus, he accepted all of these aspects of dialectics!

By adoring the doctrines of dialectics, to an extent of glorification, instead of giving a credit what is appropriate, we can see that the communists have brought Hegelianism to the fore by pushing Marxism to the background! We lose nothing by having these philosophies, and also we lose nothing by not having these philosophies – this is the conclusion I have reached. Perhaps, it is good to have these philosophies but much better not to have them! ★

37. The 'Philosophy of Poverty'! And the 'Poverty of Philosophy'!

These are the titles of two different books. Since both the books refer to Philosophy, I have gone through these books in order to see their philosophies. As I opened these books with fear for Philosophy, flipped through the pages, and read the texts with a little dislike, I found that the books primarily connected with economics than Philosophy. My fear receded and my interest on economic issues increased.

Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, a citizen of France, wrote the first of the two books in French in 1846. Marx wrote the second book as a critic of the first one in 1847 also in French. Both the

books have been translated into English eventually.

One could misunderstand Proudhon's book as ridiculing of the poor, if not interpreted correctly. Proudhon wrote this book in sympathy for the poor, not in ridicule. However, there was not enough Science in the book matching the levels of sympathy, though.

The lack of Philosophy in Proudhon's book becomes evident in Marx's 'The poverty of Philosophy'. The fundamental flaws in Proudhon were related to the economic matters. Therefore, the book of critical appraisal by Marx should have been named 'The poverty of economics'. But, as the title of Proudhon's book contains 'Philosophy', Marx too might have used the same word in his critique. Marx was critical of Proudhon's philosophical perspective that he ignored the positive aspects of Hegel and embraced only lowly matters such as 'the universal soul'.

Proudhon authored a few works earlier. In his earlier book entitled '*What is property*?' he concluded that 'property is theft'. However, this conclusion was not based on the knowledge of 'the surplus value' of the working class. Proudhon interprets the property in this way based on the worldly common sense regarding the riches of the wealthy. Marx immensely praised the book of 'property'. He described the book as an advancement of the economic matters. After reading the book, Marx communicated with Proudhon and became acquainted with him. Marx and Engels always recognized and acknowledged any progressive quality in others. After Marx's exile to France, he and Proudhon used to meet with each other.

By 1846, Marx, along with Engels, completed '*The German ideology*' and in the process of writing this book, he arrived at a comprehensive understanding on matters related to history and economics.

Before Proudhon's book on the Philosophy of poverty, Marx and Proudhon spent many a day and night in discussions. (We can infer this information from the prefaces of Engels to the works of Marx.)

Proudhon was an Anarchist. Anarchism opposes the existence and the need of the State. Marx also holds the view that there is

no need of the State. He, however, argues that the State came into existence due to the exploiting class and the working class struggle will have to attain society which does not need a state. Proudhon, in contrast, argues in favour of peaceful transformation.

'When the state is armed with a gamut of weapons, how is a peaceful transformation possible?' indeed Marx must have argued. (Although the details of the discussions are not available, in the introductory parts of Engels, there were references to some discussions.)

In his early days, Proudhon was a labourer in a printing press. He led a life of abject poverty. He considered himself a socialist. His contemporaries recognized him as one of the French socialists. Proudhon, however, did not approve of the class struggle! He would serve as a good example of the labourers who hold bourgeois perspective.

Proudhon may have considered himself a socialist, but there are numerous varieties of socialism. Proudhon's socialism was not formulated based on the understanding of the surplus value. All of the day and night discussions between Marx and Proudhon proved not fruitful. Neither one changed. While Marx embraced the class struggle, Proudhon espoused class peace! The gulf between them remained unfilled.

Following all this, Proudhon published a book called '*The Philosophy of poverty*'. He commences the book invoking 'God'. 'Let us suppose that God exists. That means, God doesn't exist,' with this reasoning, he begins the book. We do not 'suppose' of someone who really exists, do we? Since God does not exist, we suppose that he exists. The supposition really means that God does not exist – thus, continued his reasoning.

'The economists did not consider 'the exchange value' with due care. Therefore, we must examine it now,' he began his teaching. Marx's Capital had not yet appeared by this time; hence, he could make such a statement.

(Capital first appeared in German in 1867. It appeared in English in 1887. In 1846 therefore, Proudhon couldn't have known about the exchange value. Marx, however, made a reference to

many economists of that time who debated the economic matters by citing them in his critique of Proudhon.)

In his book, Proudhon primarily advised the labourers on the newer ways of organizing their labour. According to him, the labourers should produce commodities independently either as separate individuals or as small groups. They should exchange the commodities amongst themselves. The needy should get money loans with little or no interest. All the production units should form a confederation. The lands of the landlords and the places of production of production of Capitalists, must be nationalized. (Who should do this? Proudhon would not approve of the class struggle. Should the labourers seize State power and then do this by passing new Laws? But he opposes the State power as such, doesn't he? The poor, thus, should form a comfortable socialist life following the path of Hegelian universal soul by means of workers self-management system. This was the program given to the poor by Proudhon, one of the French socialists. The philosophical perspective of the poor should remain at this level!

After the release of Proudhon's book, Anenkov, a Russian scholar, wrote to Marx that he had several questions on the book and sought Marx's opinion.

Marx sent a reply (on 28 December 1846) to Anenkov.

> "You would long ago have received my answer to your letter of November 1 but for the fact that my bookseller only sent me Mr. Proudhan's book, **Philosophie de la miosere**, last week. I have gone through it in two days in order to be able to give you my opinion about it at once. As I have read the book very hurriedly, I cannot go into details but can only tell you the general impression it has made on me. If you wish I could go into details in a second letter. I must frankly confess that I find the book on the whole bad, indeed very bad."

Later Proudhon wrote to Marx, "I await your severe criticism."

The "severe criticism" indeed fell on the book and severed the friendship between the two. We come to know about this incident from a letter

(24-1-1847) Marx wrote to Schweitzer, an editor of a workers' paper:

> "This criticism, however, when it was made (in my 'Poverty of Philosophy' in 1847) was of a kind which ended our friendship forever."

By 1847, Marx had not yet written '*A contribution to the critique of political economy*'. '*Capital*' too had not yet appeared. By this time, Marx nevertheless had nearly reached a correct understanding on the economic matters. Using this understanding, Marx prepared a detailed critique of various aspects of the Proudhon's book 'The poverty of Philosophy'. Marx was critical of Proudhon on several aspects including that he literally borrowed the Idealist perspective from Hegel and that he failed to overcome the bourgeois limits of thinking, and the like.

Marx's critique of Proudhon proceeded as follows: Proudhon failed to grasp how many different forms 'the exchange' has taken in the history. There was a time when the producers exchanged goods only to satisfy their needs. Gradually, the system of exchanging goods meant for making money had begun. Under capitalism, production of goods is carried out hundred percent only for sale.

Proudhon intended to reform the evils of commodity production. He, however, failed to understand that the evil features in commodity production become a necessary condition. Regardless of how small may be the scale of production, the phenomenon of 'competition' is inevitable. The consequences of the competition lead to wars inevitably. Proudhon was unconcerned of abolishing Capitalist system. He advocated many reforms but did not specify the agent who should bring about such reforms. Proudhon did not realize that the working class constitutes the 'revolutionary force'. Proudhon lacked clarity regarding the aspects of exploitation such as land rent and interest. 'Money' is not only a commodity but is also a relation. All the contradictions emerging in the name of 'money' arise from the exploiting character of the mode of production. Not only the wealth but also the misery 'develops' in Capitalist system. To understand all the

contradictions of Capitalist system and educate the working masses would be the real revolutionary task. – Marx deliberated all these issues in his book.

Before writing 'Poverty of Philosophy' Marx was only a Philosopher, and after the book, he also began transform into an Economist.

In his book, for the first time, Marx explained why trade unions are necessary. The 'human Nature' takes a form depending on the Nature of the production relations – he clarified. The stages in the forms of property depend on the phases of the production relations – he said. The forms of the production relations depend on the production forces – he opined.

The term 'Labour-power' was not yet invented by the time of 'The poverty of Philosophy'. Marx only used the term 'Labour' everywhere in his work.

Marx pointed out the misconceptions in Proudhon's book and discussed each and every aspect in detail. He made various comments depending on the context.

'In Capitalist system, there is no element that will not be transformed into a commodity' Marx said. All the moral concepts such as virtue, love and affection, faith, fame and prestige, wisdom, spirit, and conscience are commodities. There is a market price for each of them. Proudhon has a readymade answer to each of these questions as if every element must have an exchange value.

At every place, Proudhon discussed value in terms of the supply and demand. As a matter of fact, the value is an element formed based on the total labour time required for the production of the commodity. The bourgeois economists ignore this fact.

Proudhon considers the assumption that 'the prices increase when the wages increase' as a natural economic principle. He accepts the erroneous practice of the society as a rational principle.

'It would be meaningless to say that all kinds of labours generate surplus value; this cannot be proved,' asserts Proudhon. Marx is highly critical of this statement and elaborates extensively on this misconception.

Marx defines elements such as the Land-rent, interest, and profit as the expressions of the social relations. He explains the transformation of the form of the labour relations by illustrating the changes occurred in hand tools, hand-operated mills, and the steam engine.

Proudhon grasps the changes of the society in his own way. He realizes that the human beings do not have the capability to understand how they live. He, however, fails to grasp the economic transformation. He considers 'the division of Labour' as a very simple matter.

Proudhon considered machines as entities similar to the phenomenon of competition, loan and the like. He would not understand each element differently based on qualities unique for that element. 'A machine is not superior to the ox harnessed to the plow,' says Marx. The inference is that a machine is as much a tool as that of the oxen and the plow. He asserts further, 'A machine is different from the relation in which it is used.' All the relations in which the machine are not the same – is the intended meaning.

In 'Poverty of Philosophy,' Marx asserts that 'The caste system is a form of division of Labour.' He defined the various forms of division of labour that exist in domestic industry, small-scale and large-scale industries as different forms. The emphasis is on having a proper perspective regarding the division of labour with reference to human relations and its transformation. He criticized that Proudhon did not see the division between the town and the village.

In his own way, 'Proudhon committed the same errors as the economists before him did', concluded Marx. Proudhon followed the same path as his predecessors, asserted Marx. All this amounts to Proudhon considering the emergence of the economic categories from the bosom of God, observed Marx.

> "He (Proudhon) gives us an absurd philosophic theory because he fails to understand the social system of today", wrote Marx in his letter to Anenkov.

Proudhon did not reform himself even after reading the critique of Marx in 'The poverty of Philosophy'. Instead, he

severed friendship with Marx! He repeated his errors in the writings that followed.

Having failed to understand 'surplus value', Proudhon could not project properly his new ideas on the economic matters regardless of his enthusiasm. 'Man exploiting man,' he would say instead of understanding this as 'the class of Masters' exploiting the 'class of Labourers'. He fails to grasp the roots from where evils such as 'one labourer exploits another' arise.

'Economically Capitalist system, politically the state, and spiritually the church – all the three are the same. Attacking anyone of them is attacking all the three,' said Proudhon in his '*The confession of a revolutionary*' written in 1851. These are quite valuable ideas. He, however, did not specify who should attack and how. He would not define the attack as the working class struggle. If he understood the attack as class struggle, what would be the distinction between him and Marx?

The leader of the working masses who defined property as 'theft', however, lacked the wisdom to incriminate the thieves.

★ We all think that the assertive statement 'property is theft' belongs to Proudhon. Marx, however, stated in a letter written to Schweitzer (24 January 1865) that the idea was originally expressed (before 1789) by an economist named Brissot (1754-1793), who lived before Proudhon.

★ Being highly critical of Proudhon that he adopted only the meaningless matters from Hegel, Marx described this as 'the old Hegelian trash'. ★

38. On Human History

Nature too has a history. If we discuss the process of evolution by way of questions like when did a given planet emerge; during what stages the plants, the animals, and the human beings had emerged in Nature?— it is concerned with the history of Nature.

What we refer to 'history' here is of the 'human' beings, not of Nature. As one can understand phenomena of Nature through disciplines specific to Nature, the matters related to 'human history' can be understood

only through disciplines specific to human history.

To study and understand Nature, there are dozens of sciences such as the Astronomy, Geology, Botany, Zoology, Physiology, Chemistry, and the like. Each of these sciences explains one particular aspect of Nature.

Several theories emerge to understand human history. Every emerging theory may not remain stable to survive long. The theories that fail to grasp and explain the real facts related to human history become useless regardless of how long they are in vogue.

The actual fact of human history is the tyranny of relations of production involving exploitation of labour that began thousands of years ago and continues to exist even today. Marxism is the theory that discovered the foundation of production relations in the human history and the secret of exploitation of labour hiding therein. Only Marxism could explain human history from the Materialist perspective. The correct approach that can explain human history is 'Historical Materialism'. Marxism alone could comprehend it.

Materialism is a rational thinking based on the cause-and-effect relationship All of the natural sciences function based on the rational logic. There is no room in them for irrationalities. In relation to human history also, a theory must function based on the rational logic. Since the human history is abounding in qualities of exploitation, various kinds of irrationalities occupy important places in history.

When a rational theory emerges to explain human history, then it becomes a 'science'. A theory based on miracles, super-natural power, and the glory of the monarchy cannot stand as a real science.

By understanding surplus value produced by the Working Class, Marx and Engels could grasp the fact of exploitation of labour by the class of masters. Nevertheless, until the time of this discovery (and even to this day), people considered whatever happens in the society and whatever is visible as something natural since they saw some are rich and some are poor; and some are masters and some are servants (workers). Every class believes

that division of population into different sections is natural in society. The working class, deprived of property, endures the drudgery in great patience and keeping all the faith in the Almighty as if the suffering is inevitable.

At a time when the exploitation was not yet deciphered, what the working masses wished was only for a few temporary reliefs. The slaves in the past, however, were not aware of real liberation and the path to achieve it, other than seeking the alleviation of the agonies of the slavery to some extent.

The difference in the relations between the masters and slaves; and the masters and workers is only in the form, not 'quality'.

Marx and Engels exposed the secret of exploitation of labour perpetrated through the human history for thousands of years. The secret of exploitation of labour had enabled us to understand all the conditions of past, present and future.

The distinctions in the form of strata and classes within the society that appeared natural until that time stood exposed and it became evident that these distinctions are not natural but constitute hostile classes. The hostile qualities of the hostile classes, existent even to this day, actually are in the class of masters itself. The class of masters is the enemy that exploits the working class and subjects the workers to exploitation and oppression. But the working class does not exploit the class of Masters.

The working class must liberate itself by defying exploitation by the other class. If the working class is able to carry out this task, it will become necessary for the exploiting class to perform labour for its survival. From that time onwards will appear a society of real human relations devoid of exploitation of labour and it will continue.

It was Marx and Engels who explained that human history, that is human society, must be understood from a Materialist point of view. Engels named this outlook briefly as 'historical Materialism' at a time when Marx was not alive. This label is appropriate. Today, all the Marxists use the same term.

The economics of the exploiting class defends the

sources of exploitation such as the land rent, interest, and profit as a right of these classes. The criticism of Marx leveled against this brand of economics counters every source of exploitation with a rational logic. With the exposure of the exploitation of labour, Economics of the exploiting class and its Philosophy would turn upside down. The same thing happened due to Marx and Engels.

For the first time during 1945 and 1846, Marx and Engels elaborated on historical Materialism in '*The German Ideology*' in great detail. Later in 1859, Marx briefly touched upon this issue in his work 'A contribution to the critique of political economy'. If we examine these two works, we can understand details about Historical Materialism.

Marx wrote Capital after these two books. One can understand the issues related to economics only if we know what exploitation of labour is and how it takes place, we will be able to understand other issues. Unless we know about exploitation first, all the other matters will not become comprehensible regardless of how easily they are explained. Therefore, one must study Capital first.

In the next chapter, we will see what Marx and Engels discussed in 'The German Ideology' a few issues related to history from the Materialist perspective. ★

39. Historical Materialism

The issues that Marx and Engels discussed in '*The German Ideology*' explain the Historical Materialism.

The following points are only a brief summary, but not an exact reproduction of the original sentences. These are very few in number based on the first 100 pages of the book. (Unless specifically mentioned all the forthcoming quotations are from *The German Ideology.)*

Marx and Engels:

The very existence of the human beings is the first basis of human history.

First, we must recognize the physical frame of the human society and the relation of human beings with Nature.

There appear many

differences between the human beings and the animals. The main difference is with regard to producing means of subsistence. The animals live on the substances readily available in Nature and cannot produce anything on their own. Only the human beings perform labour. Human beings, therefore, are connected to one another by production (labour) relations.

Human beings are capable of producing only such means of subsistence which are possible in a given stage in which they live. In a stage where they know nothing except hunting, only the hunting will be the means of securing sustenance of the human beings. The procreation of children is not an act of production, or a labour activity. It is merely a process or an activity related to Nature.

The production, reproduction, exchange, and distribution of things collectively constitute the human relations.

Between the agricultural and industrial labours, the agricultural labors were the first labors. The produce of the agriculture becomes the raw material for many industries. The trade originated from the exchange processes and the industrial tasks performed based on the agricultural raw materials have emerged after the agrarian labor.

> "The various stages of development in the division of labour are just so many different forms of property". (Marx & Engels in 'The German Ideology', page38, Moscow edition 1976).

The division of labor does not refer only to a division among those who perform different labours. In addition to this, the division between the people who perform labour and those who do not perform labour is also related to the division of labor. Many other issues are related to the division of labor such as - Whose labor makes the raw materials and instruments of labour (tools) and how the new products produced by the new labor using the raw materials and tools are distributed, etc.

> **Engels**: "Side by side with the great majority, exclusively bond slaves to labour, arises a class freed from directly productive labour, which looks

after the general affairs of society: direction of labour, state business, law, science, art, etc. It is, therefore, the law of division of labour that lies at the basis of the division into classes." (Anti-During, page-323, Moscow edition 1975).

Thus the 'division of labor' is not only concerned with the distinction among those who perform labour but also concerns with the relations between those who perform labour and those who do not perform labor.

The existing stage in the division of labour determines labour relations. In other words,

"the existing stage in the division of labour determines also the relations of individuals to one another with reference to the material, instrument and product of labour." (page-38)

The first form of 'property': This is the property of the primitive society (The tribal property).

In this stage, the productive forces are minimal and limited. Hunting, fishing, animal husbandry, and at the most a little bit of farming, people of the primitive society are dependent on these few forms of labour for sustenance. The division of labor is elementary in this stage. The labour is perhaps performed by the families. The population of the tribe consisted of the elders (chiefs), other members of the tribe and the slaves conquered in battles with other tribes.

The second form of 'property': The ancient communal property and the state property. A few tribes merge into larger communities either by mutual understanding or battles and establish small-scale townships. Slavery is in practice.

The private property of the family arises still being subordinate to the communal collective property. Both movable (the cattle and slaves) and immovable (land) properties make an appearance.

In the master and slaves relations, the private property progressively strengthens itself as the communal property declines. The division of labor increases.

The rural and urban governments may form independently.

The hostile relations between the slaves and masters grow in intensity and enhance further.

The concentration of the

property appeared first in Rome (Italy) among all the countries. The agrarian Laws of that time prove this fact.

Further expansion and consolidation of the private property takes place by means of battles waged by kings to occupy other territories.

The third form of 'property': The feudal or estate property. There exist serfs in the place of the slaves. The feudal lords maintain private armies. The Nobility makes a beginning.

In the cities appears the corporate property in opposition to the feudal property. The class of Aristocrats that live on exploitation emerges. The merchant leagues are concentrated. The guilds make an appearance. The members who have been undergoing apprenticeship and those who have completed such training and practicing the trade are part of the guild. The agriculture is at an elementary stage at this time and the industry at only a level of making the hand tools.

The small-scale property owners and workers live in the cities; and Princes, the clergy, Aristocrats and serfs in the villages.

The division of labor increases with increasing industry and trade. A few feudal kingdoms merge into an empire with an emperor at its head! The small-scale peasants, who are neither masters nor slaves, gradually turn into labourers.

We must see the connection between the Nature of the production relations and politics. The erroneous perception that history progresses autonomously in a random fashion can be rectified only when the Nature of the production relations is understood.

The real conditions essential for the liberation of the human being: The production of things necessary for immediate subsistence, the production of things necessary for the new needs, and the family relations.

> "The …circumstance which, from the very outset, enters into historical development, is that men, who daily re-create their own life, begin to make other men, to propagate their kind: the relation between man and woman, parents and children, the **family**." (page48)
> "…in the family, where wife and children are the slaves of

the husband. This latent slavery in the family, though still very crude is the first form of property." (page52)

The division of labor and private property are identical expressions of the same thing. The division of labor is an activity; and, the property is the product of that activity. (Whatever the labourers get is their property and whatever the Master gets is his property. What Capitalist owner always gets is the surplus value of the workers. A part of the surplus value will go for the subsistence of the owner's family and their luxuries. Yet another part of the surplus value will be spent on expanding the means of production by purchasing of the new means of production. The old means of production also have come from the older surplus value only. The property of the owner, whether it is old or new means of production has not been derived from the labor of the owner.)

The character of a given society depends on the specific relations of material production in which people live. And, the consciousness too will be in accordance with the production relations. The 'consciousness' consists of ideas, understanding, opinions, beliefs, and illusions etc. – all put together. That consciousness is linked with the material relations.

The politics, Laws, religions, ethics, arts, *Vedanta* and, philosophies – all form according to the Nature of the production relations. The consciousness of individuals cannot be separated from the social existence and its Nature.

History is only a succession of generations that follow one after the other. Every generation initially depends on the means of production left by the preceding generation. The new generation continues the same old means of production and transforms these old conditions by means of new activities. (page 58)

The invention of a new machine results in the loss of jobs and subsistence for the people in other countries. Every new invention shows an impact on the whole world. (page 58)

"When the crude form of the division of labour which is to be found among the Indians and Egyptians calls forth the caste-system in their state and religion, the historian believes

that the caste-system is the power which has produced this crude social form." (The German Ideology, page 63.)

A Materialist must understand that the differences such as the caste system have originated out of specific production relations. The Idealist, however, understands that - the production relations have formed only due to the caste system! This means that the caste system is the primary thing!

A brief description by Marx in his 'Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy':

"The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which rises a legal and political consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the social, political and intellectual life process in general. It is not the conscious-ness of men that determines their consciousness." (page 181. Marx & Engels Selected Works, Moscow edition, 1970)

Engels: "These two great discoveries, the Materialistic conception of history and the revelation of the secret of capitalistic production through surplus value, we owe to Marx. With these discoveries socialism became a science. The next thing was to work out all its details and relations." (Socialism, Utopian and Scientific in Marx & Engels Selected Works, page 411).

In the next chapter, we will see a few issues Marx and Engels discussed regarding 'Communism'. ★

40. The Revolutionary Dictatorship of the Proletariat!

For the complete liberation from the exploitation of labour and the formation of the revolutionary society, the working class (proletariat) must fight with the exploiting class of the owners. That revolutionary society will be the 'communist society'. Its beginning phase is 'socialism'. Our focus here must be primarily on communism, not the beginning stage. We will talk about the beginning stage also whenever necessary.

From the very moment of seizing political power from the class of owners, the proletarian class will initiate the revolu-tionary rule to transform the exploitative labour relations with the help of the revolu-tionary Laws. Since that day, the proletariat class will confiscate the land from the possession of the landlords and begin to impose revolu-tionary regulations on industries which are in possession of Capitalists. The exploiting conditions, however, will not disappear just by implementing these two measures.

Here, we may consider some of the revolutionary changes that must happen from the day the communist society begins. Some of these changes will be as follows:

- The rule of the working class (The Dictatorship of the Proletariat).
- Confiscation of the means of production.
- Every person must work.
- The problem of the 'productive forces'
- Abolition of the exploitative division of labor
- Abolition of commodity production.
- Abolition of money
- The 'use value' perspective.
- The communist ethics, art forms, and culture
- Abolition of the 'wage system!'
- The abolition ('withering away') of the state!

'Dictatorship of the Proletariat' will be needed to implement all these revolutionary changes. The working people must have clarity on many of these issues.

We cannot discuss any of these matters here in greater detail. Here, we can consider these issues only in brief. Marx's '*Capital*' is the basis to understand these issues in greater detail.

- **The rule of the working class**: The rule begins in the name of the 'Dictatorship of the Proletariat'. When we consider here a few issues Marx and Engels discussed, we will understand the purpose of this 'dictatorship'. This dictatorship will be necessary for the working class to end the exploitation and oppression by the ruling class completely.

If the exploiting class realizes the meanness of living on the exploitation of labour of others and agrees to give up exploitation without any struggle, there will be no need for any

class or class dictatorship.

Somewhere in his writings, Engels observes that if the past evil has the wisdom to destroy itself without a struggle, the imminent transformation will happen peacefully.

It is not the working class which is responsible if it resorts to class struggle. Exploiting class is responsible for it because it does not give up exploitation. In this context, it is pertinent to cite Engels' observation in his **'Principles of Communism'.**

> "Will the peaceful abolition of private property be possible? It would be desirable if this could happen, and the communists would certainly be the last to oppose it. Communists know only too well that all conspiracies are not only useless, but even harmful. They know all too well that revolutions are not made inten-tionally and arbitrarily, but that, everywhere and always, they have been the necessary consequence of conditions which were wholly independent of the will and direction of individual parties and entire classes.
>
> But they also see that the development of the proletariat in nearly all civilized countries has been violently suppressed, and that in this way the opponents of communism have been working toward a revolution with all their strength. If the oppressed proletariat is finally driven to revolution, then we communists will defend the interests of the proletarians with deeds as we now defend them with words." (Question 15 and its answer)

Let us see some observations of Marx and Engels with reference to 'Dictatorship of the Proletariat':

1. In this first quote, Marx and Engels did not use the term 'Dictatorship of the Proletariat'. Nevertheless, the reference was to the same issue. It is not a simple task to understand these citations. From these citations, we, nevertheless, can understand that the hegemony of one exploiting class replaced by that of another exploiting class and such a change was possible only after seizing the State power. That the working class also needs hegemony to abolish any class hegemony. We understand this point with some difficulty. Have a look:

"…every class which is aiming at domination, even when its domination, as is the case with the proletariat, leads to the abolition of the old form of society in its entirety and of domination in general, must first conquer political power.." (page52-3).

2. From Marx's '*The class struggles in France, 1848-50':*

"This socialism is the declaration of the permanence of revolution, the class dictator-ship of the proletariat as the necessary transit point to the abolition of class distinctions generally, to the abolition of all the relations of production on which they rest, to the abolition of all the social relations that correspond to these relations of production, to the revolutionizing of all the ideas that result from these social relations." (page282, Marx & Engels Selected Works-1, Moscow edition 1973).

3. From the letter Marx wrote to Weydemeyer (5-3-1852):

"..class struggle necessarily leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat…this dictatorship itself only constitutes the transition to the abolition of all classes and to a classless society."

4.A small portion of the Address of Marx delivered at the 7th annual conference of the International in 1871:

"The last movement was the Commune, the greatest that had yet been made, and there could not be two opinions about it — the Commune was the conquest of the political power of the working classes. There was much misunder-standing about the Commune. The Commune could not found a new form of class government. In destroying the existing conditions of oppression by transferring all the means of labour to the productive labourer, and thereby compelling every able-bodied individual to work for a living, the only base for class rule and oppression would be removed. But before such a change could be effected a proletarian dictator-ship would become necessary, and the first condition of that was a proletarian army. The working classes would have to conquer the right to emancipate themselves on the battlefield. The task of the International was to organize and combine the forces of labour for the coming struggle." (from www.marxists.org)

5. "Between Capitalist and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other . Corres-ponding to this is also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but the revolutionary dictator-ship of the proletariat." (Marx in '*Critique of the Gotha Programme*', Moscow edition 1971)

6. Engels in 1891: "Of late, the Social-Democratic philistine has once more been filed with wholesome terror at the words: Dictatorship of the proletariat. Well and good, gentlemen, do you want to know what this dictatorship looks like? Look at the Paris Commune. That was the Dictatorship of the Proletariat." (*Foreword to Marx's* '*The Civil War in France*'. In Marx & Engels Selected Works. Moscow edition, 1970).

The first steps towards Socialist society began in Russia and China. What did the communist parties of these countries write on the 'Dictatorship of the Proletariat' in their party manifestos? What kind of revolutionary Laws did they introduce? What kind of labor did the Class of Masters begin to perform in these countries? We need these details. We will have to collect information about this issue later.

A small doubt and a brief discussion on the term 'Dictatorship of the Proletariat':

I do not have any doubt at all on issues such as - how the working class intends to implement revolutionary Laws in the name of 'dictatorship', how the working class aims at bringing about revolutionary changes in the society, and how this class is determined to turn the society upside down. All these measures are most essential and the working class must implement them. In order to accomplish all that, the working class has no other way except eliminating the forces of exploitation by means of class struggle. All this is a struggle for justice; a struggle in self-defense; and a struggle for liberation.

When the struggles of the working class are so justified, how can we call such struggles a 'dictatorship'? How can we call such struggles 'Hegemony'? – This is the question.

The class of workers too is a class. However, this is not an

exploiting class. Only the acts of the exploiting classes and their rules make a dictatorship Can we call the just struggles of liberation a dictatorship? What is the aim of the working class? - Liberation! To preserves its own labor! Its aim is not to absolve the exploiting classes from the debasement of exploitation. When the working class protects its labor, the exploiting class will have no option other than performing labour in order to survive itself. The working class will implement all the revolutionary measures necessary to prevent from being subjected to exploitation again. All this is to ensure that exploitation will not raise its head. There shall be revolutionary Laws, actions, and changes to ensure this. Even then, how the terms such as 'Hegemony', 'domination' or 'dictatorship' are appropriate to define these acts? Can retaliatory slapping of an offender be 'domination'? Can we use a word 'domination' to define such an action?

Why should we call our struggle a 'dictatorship'?

There is an answer to this question. The 'Dictatorship of the Proletariat' is meant for abolishing the exploiting class, its exploitative relations, traditions, cultures, and the like. Moreover, a large majority of the working masses is buried up to the neck in the exploiting culture and traditions. Even if the State power is seized with the help of these very working masses, the ideology of such a change will be limited by their consciousness. Fighting as soldiers for power does not mean that these people have shed the influences of the old and evil culture. Therefore, the working masses too must reform themselves with many revolutionary ideas. If there exist authoritarian tendencies amidst the working masses, the presence of Laws that suppress such tendencies are justifiable. Nevertheless, such measures constitute domination over the offenders. However, this is a 'revolutionary hegemony'!

Wars are just or unjust. War is ' war' regardless of how just the war may be. Such an act can only be called a war. Likewise, regardless of how just the class struggle of the workers may be since this struggle effectively suppresses the other exploiting classes and the exploiting

qualities present within the working class, it can be named only 'a dictatorship', although such suppression is justified.

'War' is a negative word. However, when called 'just war' the negative quality of the word is replaced by a positive meaning. Likewise, 'dictatorship' is a very bad word. However, if we call it 'just dictatorship', 'revolutionary dictatorship', or 'Self-defensive dictatorship', that word will acquire a positive meaning.

Even then, why should the working class call its just struggle a 'dictatorship'? Why qualify its struggle as 'dictatorship'? Is there no other way to define this struggle?

'The liberation struggle of the working class'

'The revolutionary struggle against exploitation'

'The struggle of the working class in self-defense'

Can any label such as this that does not alter the aims of the working class be damaging to the fighting spirit and the liberation of the working masses? The answer is a 'no'. In comparison with the terms such as 'just struggle' or 'righteous struggle', a name such as 'revolutionary dictatorship' can signify more enforcement, justice, and consciousness. The 'revolutionary dictatorship' is not going to stay forever. The sooner the exploiting classes realize their evil doings and reform themselves into honoring the just, refined and equal relations, the sooner the necessity for the revolutionary dictatorship will end. And, the glow of the peace torch will illuminate sooner.

In spite of such small doubt regarding the term 'Dictatorship of the Proletariat', I like the notion of the 'revolutionary dictatorship of the Proletariat'. Marx and Engels referred to the 'Dictatorship of the Proletariat' as the 'revolutionary dictatorship of the Proletariat' on several occasions. We should not define this notion without the adjective 'revolutionary'.

Questions apart; when we begin to change labels, every party can change names according to its whims. This trend can be dangerous. It is important to debate the questions instead of suppressing them.

The 2nd International opposed the concept of the 'Dictatorship of the Proletariat'. The aim of the 2nd International was class collaboration, not class struggle.

Our aim is not class collaboration. We should not tolerate even an iota of compromise in the class struggle. The utmost critical thing for the working masses is the revolutionary struggle of the working class! The revolutionary dictatorship is to ensure this! The 'just dictatorship' is as justified as the 'just war'! ★

41. How should the Exploitative Division of Labour change?

[I have discussed this question in detail in my 'Introduction to Marx's 'Capital' in a chapter titled, 'Even if all persons do labour, the problem of ineqality will not be solved)' Even if all persons do labour, the problem of 'inequality' will not be solved!' We have to repeat the same points wherever we discuss the question of 'Division of Labour'. Hence, I am giving here the abridged version of that chapter. I, however, did not mention what Marx said about changing the Division of Labour in my Introduction…I am adding it here for the first time.]

In the previous chapter (Revolutionary Dictatorship of the Proletariat), we have discussed some issues concerning the transformation of exploitative society in order to arrive at the Communist society. The first issue that we discussed is Revolutionary Dictatorship of the Proletariat. Now, division of labour is another issue. If we understand this, all other issues will be understood easily.

In the past, prior to Capitalism, there used to be a situation wherein a laboring person could perform four or five kinds of labour. In addition of labour related to cultivation, they used to perform all the labours connected with animal husbandry. Handicraftsmen used to carry on all tasks related to agriculture. Dress makers of the olden times could make many kinds of garments. Physicians of the olden times could examine any and every kind of ailment. In the past, people who perform labours had the ability to perform several kinds of labour.

But under Capitalism, due to competition to sell commodities, phenomenon of specialization among the labourers has been introduced with an intention to

invest huge capital, get the commodities produced in a short period of time, sell them at a higher value and secure huge profits. Under this system, to make a shirt, one person will cut the cloth, another stitches—within the job of stitching, one person stitches the collar, another stitches hands, yet another person stitches pockets and still another person stitches buttons.

In the case of labour of medical practice, one treats eyes, another treats teeth and yet another nose. Every work is transformed like this. In future, further specialization may take place in such a way that in future one physician treats right eye while the other treats the left eye. (These days already we have specialization within the single eye: we have cornea specialists, retina specialists, glaucoma specialists and so on.) the problem of 'inequality' will not be solved!

The person, who stitches buttons to a shirt, even if he acquires high skill in stitching buttons rapidly, will be irrelevant for any other task in life. He can't stitch his own shirt. This situation amounts to physical disability and living in darkness!

Every kind of Division of Labour is related to both Use value and Exchange value. We have been arguing that everyone has to perform labour in order to eliminate exploitation of labour. Certainly this should happen first. But, the problem of exploitation will not be solved merely by that. We have to examine this issue further.

"All persons doing labour"—what does this mean? Let us suppose that every person is doing 'some labour or the other'. Then, does it mean that all the features of exploitative society have been eliminated?

Let us assume that we have abolished Capitalist state power. The construction of a new society, whereby 'private properties' are transformed into 'collective properties', has commenced. In that new society, everyone (both men and women) is performing some labour or the other and getting the 'value of their labour'. As the children, the old, the sick and the physically handicapped cannot work, every person who labours has to give up a part of the fruit of his/her labour for the sake of maintaining them. Let us

suppose that, except such part, which has to be given up, each will get the rest of the value of his labour. Now, there are no 'land rents', no 'interests', and no 'profits'. There are not any such differences as 'capitalist' and 'worker'. All persons will perform 'some labour' or the other and receive the value thereof. Let us suppose that the whole thing is taking place quite correctly, accurately and without any fraud. Does it mean that, with this, the problem has totally been resolved? Is this the 'Communist society'?

Let us now see certain circumstances.

All kinds of labour will continue to exist as they existed in the exploitative society with all such differences as tailoring, weaving, tilling, teaching, medical practice and driving. These differences among various kinds of labour will never disappear. When differences among the kinds of labour are indispensable, differences in the expenses for their 'labour powers' will also be indispensable. This situation will keep the values of those kinds of labour different even in the new society.

We must assume that in the 'new society', there would be no calculations of value at all and that products would be consumed without calculations of value, purchases and sales. But, such a change does not take place in the new society right from the beginning. Which means, the new society begins with the abolition of private property while calculations of value exist as ever? 'Value' will have to be done away with only by means of changes that take place after the commencement of the 'new society'.

In fact, the Communist society begins with the measures like abolition of property rights of the landlords over the land. It is not possible at the very beginning to get rid of the old social relations.

While the income of a person who performs manual labour is low, the income of a person who performs Mental labour is high, isn't it? In such a situation, how is equality possible between such persons? If equality is not possible even when all people perform labour, how can Communist society be able to establish equality?—these are the questions that confront us.

In the New society, however,

the difference between the value of a 'mental labour' and that of a 'manual labour' will not be as great as it was in exploitative societies. Because the New society attempts to reduce that gap right from the beginning. The new society reduces the wages of mental labour to some extent and raises the wages of manual labour to some extent. It abolishes the privileges of mental labourers and makes certain facilities available to all in an equal measure. It is possible for the new society to achieve this first change.

Even the new society cannot remove the indispensable difference between the value of mental labour and the value of manual labour.

While certain kinds of labour are of higher value and certain others of lower value, what would be the consequences if each person does anyone single labour only?

We have to examine this consequence both from the perspective of 'value' and the perspective of 'use value' as well.

From the perspective of value:

If a person does tailoring, another practices medicine. If the tailor has a low income, a doctor will have a high income. The higher income of a doctor might be the result of his own labour. It might not have been earned by exploiting others. Yet, the situation will be such that the income of a person who performs a labour of lower value will always be less and the income of a person who performs a labour of higher value will always be more.

Shall we say, why do not all persons learn various kinds of labours of higher value right from the beginning? Should all persons perform labour of medical treatment? Then, does society need medical treatment alone and not need tailoring ? Does it need only mental labour and not manual labour? Society needs all kinds of labour. It needs many bottommost manual labours. There should be certain persons engaged in each labour. It is a must. There will be differences of 'more' and 'less' among values of various kinds of labour. It too is a must.

Bound by these two conditions, when a person performs only one labour, people will be divided into certain sections. All those who get low income form one section

and all those who get medium income form another section, while those with high income form yet another section.

The offspring of those who get higher income go in for more expensive education. Like their parents, they would go again into the kinds of labour with a higher value. On the other side, the offspring of those who get low income find themselves performing again labour of a lower value. These distinctions will perpetuate.

Even if we assume that society itself bears the expenses of children's education up to a certain level through a social fund, there won't be a big change in the values of different kinds of labour. Variations in parental income are bound to affect the living conditions of children in one way or the other. Thus, owing to the condition of 'doing only one particular labour', differences in income will necessarily arise and people still will remain in 'inequality'. Then where is the scope for 'equality' even in the Communist society ?

Now, from the use-value perspective:

Every person performs 'only one labour', isn't it? That is some do tailoring, some medical practice, some teaching, some driving, some sweeping the roads, some cleaning drainage and so on.

Every labour is necessary for human life. But, when a person does the same kind of work throughout the life, it becomes monotonous. Whatever be the Nature of the work, 'doing the same kind of work' every day and every hour throughout the life will torture that person terribly. A tailor always tailoring, a weaver always weaving, a ploughman always tilling, a driver always driving, a sweeper always sweeping the roads, a sewerage-cleaner always cleaning the sewerage-thus, such a condition in which a person does the same sort of work every day and every hour makes that person a soulless machine. It creates an aversion for the 'work' itself and kills the real pleasure of work.

It is very wrong if anyone thinks that this feeling of monotony is caused only in manual labour but not in the mental labour. Whatever be the labour, if a person performs the same labour throughout the life it is certainly painful to that person.

Even if a doctor or a teacher

declares, "I never felt monotony in my work", persons who perform manual labour will not say so. There is no scope at all for a person who always drives lorries, for a person who always digs mines, for a person who always carries loads, for a person who always does cooking, not to feel his/her work monotonous.

While considering a person who is always engaged in cleaning sewerage pipes and another person who is engaged in the writing work even without getting down from the chair alike, if we say, "Both are working alike", does it mean 'working alike'? Does it mean that the two have become equals? No.

Owing to the fact that a person performs the same labour always, certain sections have to remain always in various kinds of manual labour, while certain sections are always found in various kinds of mental labour; everything just as in the old society. There is no scope for these sections of manual labourers to develop intellectually and culturally. This condition continues to keep people occupationally divided as in the past. If all those who perform mental labour constitute one section, those who perform manual labour fall into another section. Each section will have its own problems and way of life. Which means, the condition in which a person performs the same labour, besides culminating into a cruel punishment for any person, also keeps human beings divided into various sections. The confinement of human beings to unequal conditions of labour is a characteristic inherited from the exploitative societies only.

Seen either from the angle of 'value' or from the angle of 'use-value', the condition wherein a person performs the same labour is full of contradictions. It is not useful for the unity, equality and development of various aspects of human beings.

The 'division of labour' in which a person performs only one labour throughout the life is a division of labour, which has capitalist character. (We will see this in detail in the chapter on 'Manufacture' in our Introduction to Marx's Capital'). If a person performs the same work, he would soon excel in it so that he would be able to turn out more work in less time. Capitalism needs such a

situation. Capitalist is not concerned with the torture which the persons who do labour experience, and the harm to which their physical and mental health are subjected by this method.

What is the solution to this problem?

Humans must become equal both from the point of view of 'value' as well as from the point of view of 'use-value'? What is the solution to achieve this? The solution is simply this. A person should perform certain different kinds of labours instead of doing only one labour. When he does so, the problem that arises from the point of view of 'value' and the problem that arises from the point of view of 'use value' as well will be resolved. Which means, Capitalist division of labour has to be changed into a 'Communist division of labour'?

Let us now see how this change should take place.

Let us suppose that there are 100 sorts of labour in the 'new society'. Of these sorts of labour, let us suppose,40 of them are mental labour and the 60 are manual labour. Let us categorize mental labour into 2 grades as upper level labour and lower level labour. Let us categorize the manual labour also into 2 grades. It means that all labour in a society exists at 4 levels.

The various kinds of labour in the 'capitalist society' are of many more levels (many grades). But, to make our example simpler, we have reduced all kinds of labour into 4 groups only. As A,B,C,D groups. Certain kinds of labour together form one group. All labour in that group will have the same value. Which means, all those kinds of labour that possess the same level of value constitute one group? Thus, we will have 4 groups. Let us suppose that the details of those groups are as follows.

There will be various kinds of labour in each grade:

1. Higher mental labour: This is the 'A' group. The implication is that these kinds of labour possess the same value. Each of these kinds of labour is a higher mental labour.

Labours in this grade are of 18 kinds.

2. Lower mental labour: This is the 'B' group. All these kinds of labour possess the

same value.

Labours in this grade are of 22 kinds.

3. Higher manual labour: This is the 'C' group. All these kinds of labour possess the same value.

Labours in this grade are of 25 kinds.

4. Lower manual Labours: This is the 'D' group. All these kinds of labour possess the same value.

Labours in this grade are of 35 kinds

Total labours in the society are of 100 kinds

When it becomes inevitable for all kinds of labour to be of 4 grades with 4 different kinds of value, the condition whereby one person performs only one labour implies division of all persons into 4 grades. Therefore, the change that should now take place is that each person of each group should perform one labour. Each one , according to this method, now gets as his/her share 2 kinds of manual labour and 2 kinds of mental labour. These 4 kinds of labour possess 4 kinds of value. The labour of 'A' grade labour has a very high value and 'D' group labour has a very low value and the 2 other kinds of labour that lie in between are of 2 different grades of value.

Let us suppose that the labour of medical practice stands as an 'A' group labour. When we say that each person should perform a labour of higher value, does it mean that each person should practice medicine? No. There are 18 kinds of labour in all in the higher grade. If someone performs any one of those kinds of labour, it amounts to performing a higher level labour. If a person performs one labour each from each of the groups, he will have performed manual labour, mental labour, semi- mental and semi-manual labour. Then the labour of each person thus acquires the same value. It means that each person performs a labour of the same value.

Let us see this through a small example.

Suppose the values of labours in the 4 groups of our example are as follows:

Let us assume that the length of the labour time in all the branches is the same.

Value of any labour in group 1 is — 4 rupees.

Value of any labour in group 2 is — 3 rupees.

Value of any labour in group 3 is — 2 rupees.

Value of any labour in group 4 is — 1 rupee.

Let us say an individual performs each kind of labour from each group successively for 4 days. (This does not mean that he/she should change his/her labour daily. We are assuming like this only to make our example simple.) If a person performs the labours of all the groups successively for 4 days, all the values taken together become 1+2+3+4=10 rupees. It means that the individual performed a labour of 10-rupee value in 4 days.

Another person, let us say, performed labours that are different from those which the first person performed from those 4 groups. The value of his/her labour too would be 1+2+3+4=10.

Though these two individuals performed different kinds of labour, values of their labours are equal.

Similarly, if each person changes his labour periodically and performs one labour each from all the 4 groups, the value of the labour of all the persons would be identical. Then there won't be such distinction as 'one person did more labour and another person did less labour' does not arise. This condition leads to a wonderful change—a change that would lead to the elimination of value itself. Elimination of value means doing away with calculations of money. The calculations—such as 'how much wage should a person get and how much income should a person receive? - are no longer necessary.

Since all persons perform 2 kinds of manual and 2 kinds of mental labour, a mass of products, which all persons require, will be created by the labour of all. In producing it, all people do labour alike. The value of one's labour would not be more, and the value of another's labour would not be less. Therefore, all of them can consume the product in an equal way. Which means, that 'new relations of production' will be formed between people? They will be in relations of equality from the point of view of doing labour and hence it will be possible for them to be equal also

with regard to consuming products. It now becomes possible to do away with money. That is, it becomes possible to do away with selling and buying.

We have been arguing right from the beginning that 'value is unnatural'. It should be removed. Human relations should be formed by means of 'use value' and not by means of 'value'. We have to build such 'natural relations'. To achieve it, this alone is the way. First, a change, namely, 'All persons have to perform labour' should begin. Thereafter, a change must take place in the old Division of Labour. It is of no use if only the first change takes place and the second change won't take place.

The 'foundation' for the elimination of 'value' cannot be laid as long as the situation whereby a person performs only one kind of labour exists. When one person is doing only one kind of labour, the value produced by one person will be more and the value produced by another person will be less. That is, they will be unequal in the 'matter of production' and hence they will have to be unequal even in the matter of receiving products. If such circumstances exist, it is not possible to remove value, at any point of time.

No change takes place in society without the formation of the requisite conditions. The problem of value disappears only when a situation emerges in which all persons labour alike. All this is concerned with the aspect of value.

If we consider the aspect of 'use value', this problem will also be resolved now. The physical and the mental troubles created by the condition wherein a person always does the same kind of work, will not be there when a person performs different kinds of labour. Thus, those sections of labourers who perform manual labour all through their life will be able to come out of that life. Every person will acquire various capacities to do both manual and mental labour and thereby develop in all aspects. As a result, there arises equality in the living conditions of humans. For all this to happen, the 'capitalist division of labour' whereby a person does the same work should be transformed into a 'new division of labour'

whereby a person can perform different kinds of labour.

We have to consider two more things with regard to the transformation of 'old division of labour' into the 'new division of labour'.

The existing division of labour between men and women should also change. The division of labour between town and country should also change.

Housework, childcare and the care of the aged are the special duties of women in exploitative societies. These special duties are obligatory also for those women who take part in outside jobs. This 'division of labour' also should change into a new system. Such changes should take place as : 'men performing the work which hitherto stood as women's duties; and women also doing all sorts of labour which only men used to do earlier'. (We will see the other details concerning this issue in the chapter 'Productive labour and unproductive labour' in our Introduction to Marx's 'Capital'. We will see about the division of labour between town and country in the chapter 'Large-scale industry and Agriculture').

Now, an important question here is, 'Can every person perform various kinds of labour, more specifically, 'higher kind of mental labour?' To entertain such a doubt amounts to thinking that those who are now performing mental labour are endowed with special characteristics, while those who are performing manual labour are condemned to perform them only because they are lacking 'intellect'. It is because of such an opinion that the question, 'Is it possible for all to perform mental labour', arises.

Could a person, who is now a great 'engineer', become a great engineer as he is now, if he had been brought up in a poor family, herding cattle without entering a school at all?

It is true that mental abilities and capacities of humans also vary just as there are differences in the physical abilities and capacities. But, differences in intellectual abilities and capacities do not stand in the way of performing mental labour just as differences in physical abilities and capacities do not stand in the way of performing manual labour.

If there are no external

conditions favourable to a person's abilities and capacities, the fact that the person possesses those abilities and capacities will never reveal itself.

Everyone having a brain can perform 'mental labour' just as every one having a body can perform 'manual labour'. 'Mental' abilities are by no means the property of certain sections of persons. It is possible cent percent for anyone having a sound mind and a sound body to learn certain kinds of manual labour and certain kinds of mental labours.

People cannot learn Arts merely by practice. Painting, writing, music, dance and other capacities constitute arts. They can be performed both 'mechanically' as well as 'creatively'. If creative power alone could be considered as 'art' and if the 'natural sensibility' pertaining to it is there in the brain even by birth, practice helps it in unfolding and developing. A person who is lacking in artistic sensibility might go on practicing an art without much use.

('Natural sensibility' in relation to 'art' is not something that is divorced from 'material' conditions. Anything in the brain is a material thing. This is not to describe 'art' as something that is unrelated to the brain. But, everyone has a brain and yet everyone will not have 'art'. The specific sensibility pertaining to 'art' is there only because of some specialty in the brain).

But, aspects related to labour and sciences are not similar to those related to arts. Any person with normal physical and mental health can learn them by practice. There are natural variations in the abilities and capacities of human beings. Therefore, variations are necessarily found in the degree of learning them. If some people learn it quickly, others learn it late. If some have skill in a certain kind of work, others will have skill in another type of work. Generally speaking, keeping aside all these natural differences, all persons can learn all types of labour.

If trained right from the childhood, a person—whether a man or a woman—can learn tailoring as well as medical practice. A person can learn tilling as well as teaching. A person can learn engineering

work as well cleaning lavatories. A person can do scientific research as well as cooking . A person can prepare reports for newspapers as well as drive lorries. A person can operate aircraft as well as tend cattle. Thus, human beings can learn not only two jobs each but as many as four or six kinds of work each. It is not at all impossible for a person to perform some manual labours and some mental labours.

The 'new society' should gradually introduce this 'new division of labour', displacing the 'capitalist division of labour'.

The sections of mental labourers will be as unwilling to take up manual labour as the non-labouring class of exploiters will be unwilling to do labour.

These sections of mental labour raise doubts such as: 'should intellectuals also perform manual labour? Can manual labourers perform intellectual labour?' Those who perform manual are not born as such. But, capitalist intellectuals think so. Intellectuals of this kind think that certain human beings are manual labourers and certain others, intellectual labourers by birth. Children, in the course of growing up, become either manual labourers or mental labourers, depending upon the opportunities, which they get. Capitalist intellectuals do not like to acknowledge this fact.

In Capitalist society, the sections of manual labourers and the sections of mental labourers are found isolated from each other as if a round circle has been drawn around them. (While there is also a class, which does not do any labour at all). The situation that emerges after the completion of this division characterizes certain people as 'intelligent people' and others as 'stupid people'.

It is commonplace that mental labourers occupy a privileged place in Capitalist's view, while manual labourers are viewed with contempt and scorn.

In addition to the general opinion that "everyone cannot perform mental labour", another opinion found ruling the minds of everyone is that mental labour alone is responsible for discovering any new thing. But, this is a part of several illusions existing in exploitative societies. It is not possible to acquire any knowledge or to

develop without the unified labour of manual and mental labour put together. (We will see this aspect also in our Introduction to 'Capital') Because of superficial consideration of issues, namely, that 'manual labour and mental labour are separated from each other and that mental labour possesses a higher value in capitalist society', an illusion is created that mental labour alone is respon-sible for any development.

The exploiter tries to avoid doing any labour as far as possible. But if it becomes inevitable for him in future history, he would seek to take mental labour at least as his share. He would see to it that he gets higher income. That is, he would like to seek to continue exploitation which will not appear as exploitation.

That is why, the question of the 'division of labour' is the most important in the matter of abolition of exploitation. It is a question of 'value' on the one hand and a question of 'use value' on the other. The 'inequalities' between human beings will not be eliminated unless the 'division of labour' wherein a person is bound to do one and the same labour is transformed into a 'new division of labour'. If we don't change a system that facilitates exploitation, it will create the same problems which exploitation creates.

We should not, therefore, limit our 'theoretical knowledge' only to the extent of saying, "All should work and each should receive the value of his work". "All people doing work" is simply the very first step in the process of elimination of exploitation. If the process stops at that point , it retains many features of exploitation. That is why the new society should at once commence the 'process of evolution' of transforming Capitalist division of labour. It should be achieved by means of proper experiments.

It does not mean that humans become a homogeneous mass of physical and mental abilities and capacities as a result of the new division of labour. There will always be natural differences in physical powers or mental powers. But, neither the persons concerned nor society at large are going to be adversely affected by such differences.

The aim of the 'new division of labour' is to provide for all

human beings equal rights and equal opportunities of living.

If we understand all this properly, that is if we understand from the viewpoint of manual labour, it becomes clear that the features of exploitation are not going to be eliminated merely because everyone performs some labour or the other.

Under Capitalism, capitalist and the workers are proceeding to the work place. Capitalist proceeds with pride in his capacity as a Master with great importance while dreaming about the 'profit'!. Whereas the worker proceeds disappointingly with low self-esteem like a servant who sold his hands while dreaming about the 'wages'! Neither of them is in a position to think about the qualities of the product in the offing.

Marx and Engels on the transformation in Division of Labour:

> "... as soon as the distribution of labour comes into being, each man has a particular, exclusive sphere of activity, which is forced upon him and from which he cannot escape. He is a hunter, a fisherman, a herdsman, or a critical critic, and must remain so if he does not want to lose his means of livelihood; while in communist society, where nobody has one exclusive sphere of activity but each can become accomplished in any branch he wishes, society regulates the general production and thus makes it possible for me to do one thing today and another tomorrow, to hunt in the morning, fish in the afternoon, rear cattle in the evening, criticize after dinner, just as I have a mind, without ever becoming hunter, fisherman, herdsman or critic." **(**The *German Ideology*, **p.53)**
>
> "The life-long specialty of handling one and the same tool, now becomes the life-long specialty of serving one and the same machine. Machinery is put to a wrong use, with the object of transforming the workman, from his very childhood, into a part of a detail-machine" (Marx). (as cited by Engels in '*Anti-Duhring*', page336, Moscow edition, 1975)

What should we infer from these words? No person should become the prisoner of the same kind of work throughout the life. One has to do some

kinds of manual labour and certain other kinds of mental labour.

Marx did not illustrate with calculations as to how contradiction in the aspect of value (money) will be resolved by performing different kinds of labour. In the Communist society, "each can become accomplished in any branch he wishes", said Marx and Engels, isn't it? We, however, should not interpret his words as if they said that one need not perform manual labours. His words imply that there is a scope for people to perform different kinds of labours which are of their choice ('wishes').

There must be a rule that every individual must perform bottommost manual labours necessary for the society. However, such a rule must become a natural thing, as natural as breathing and not like a rule. Just as the statement 'every person must work' indicates responsibility of human beings, the statement, 'every person must do manual work also' indicates human responsibility. If intellectual labourers do not acknowledge this responsibility, it amounts to saying that there must always exist different sections of people and their families to perform manual labours only. If that is the case, struggles by those who exclusively perform manual labours will be inevitable.

Practices like, not doing any labour and doing only managerial work should also be radically changed. What will be the occupation of a person who perform not one kind of labour but performs four or five kinds of labour? It is not possible to identify the exact occupation of such a person. He will be a 'producer'. In the New society, every person is a producer.

Will the specialization skills disappear if the division of labour is changed so radically? Specialization is meant for performing a given work in the least possible time. This is necessary for Capitalist. If the work is to be done without harming the physical and mental health of the workers there should not be intensity of labour. Skill does not decrease even if the work is done slowly. Skill increases if we learn the work with proper logic and responsibility. It is not justified to say that work should be done speedily.

One more point. While arguing that each person ought to do different kinds of labour, Marx spoke of 'hunting'. Hunting means killing birds and animals, isn't it? Should there be violence of killing animals for food even in such an enlightened society where each person performs different kinds of labour? This is certainly a debatable point.

Engels makes certain important observations on the question of Division of Labour as follows:

"And not only the labourers but also the classes directly or indirectly exploiting the labourers are made subject, through the division of labour, to the tool of their function: the empty-minded bourgeois to his own capital and his own insane craving for profits; the lawyer to his fossilized legal conceptions, which dominate him as an independent power; the "educated classes" in general to their manifold species of local narrow-mi0ndedness and one-sidedness, to their own physical and mental short-sightedness, to their stunted growth due to their narrow specialized education and their being chained for life to this specialized activity — even when this specialized activity is merely to do nothing." (Anti-Duhring, page336)

★

42. Some more changes in the Communist society

We have previously considered two changes necessary for the formation of the communist society. We will discuss a few more changes now. By change we mean complete abolition of the bad condition that existed previously! Or the termination of certain aspects of the past condition!

Let us consider some of them.

* **The confiscation of 'the means of production'**:

The land is a natural means

of production. The land is an integral part of Nature. No class (the working class included) has a right to possess the land as property. The human beings must use the land properly for sustenance and leave the land behind for the subsequent generations.

The raw materials and instruments of labour (the tools, the implements etc.) are also the means of production. These items, however, are not naturally available. These are the means of production produced by means of labor. These means of production have been made out of the labor of the toiling masses of numerous generations ever since the time of the slaves and the workers still make these means of production. A machine, however large it may be, comes out of the blending of the old and new manual and intellectual labors. Neither the land nor the means of production in the industries is, therefore, the property of the class of owners. For the working class to confiscate these means of production is not an offence. This confiscation is not the same as seizing the property of others. This change must take place as soon as possible. Marx and Engels tell us as to how to proceed towards such changes:

> "Considering that against this collective power of the propertied classes the working class cannot act, as a class, except by constituting itself into a political party, distinct from, and opposed to, all old parties formed by the propertied classes; That this constitution of the working class into a political party is indispensable in order to ensure the triumph of the social Revolution and its ultimate end — the abolition of classes;" (Marx & Engels, 1871. *Resolution of International Workingmen's Association*.) Collected Works, vol. 22, page 427).
>
> **Engels**: "As soon as our Party is in possession of political power it has simply to expropriate the big landed proprietors just like the manufacturers in industry." (*Peasant question in France and Germany*, Selected Works-3, page 474, Moscow 1970.

* **Every person must work**:

If a person living in a house, eating food and wearing clothes but not doing any work, it amounts to living on the labour of others.

Everyone knows that a landlord does no work other than grooming his whiskers and smoking cigars. With regard to a capitalist, however, everyone, including the workers, believes that this person toils day and night and performs great tasks. If a capitalist also performs labour, he is entitled to take the 'value of the labor power' as wages commensurate with the work he performed. He might even take the surplus value derived from his work. In reality, the salary Capitalist claims, whether or not he worked, will be a hundred times larger than that of an employee (the worker) who performed a similar work. In addition to his exploitation-related salary, Capitalist will take away all the surplus value of the workers in the name of the interest, profit, and land rent as a rightful remuneration for Capital invested. There is no natural relationship between the different portions under which the surplus value is divided among the exploiters and the produce made in the workplace. Further, there is also no connection between the produce and the Unproductive expenses Capitalist incurred, and the taxes the exploiting classes paid to the government. All these portions are part of 'the mass of the surplus value' that the exploiting classes plunder from the working class. This means that out of the 'labor value' of the worker who works 10 hours a day, the worker gets the value of only one hour of his labor as wages and the value of the rest of the nine hours goes to the owner as surplus value. Hence, the prosperity for the owner and the poverty for the worker! This is the mystery that underlies the wealth and poverty!

The intellectuals who argue that Capitalist 'works hard and performs intellectual tasks' must understand this fact again and again. 'If you work, then take a wage what is due to a worker for performing the same task. Take also the associated surplus value. But, in what name do you claim the profit, interest, and the land rent? From whose labor do you spend on Unproductive

expenses?' For the working masses to acquire such cleverness and courage to question the Capitalist, they have to stop singing the song that 'Capitalist also toils' and engage in debates discussing the actual fact again and again.

Therefore, for the abolition of an exploitative system where a class can exist without working, a rule that 'every person must work' is compulsory. (We do not have a clarity regarding whether or not the families of the exploiting classes were made to work in the socialisms of Russia and China.)

> **Marx**: "In destroying the existing conditions of oppression by transferring all the means of labour to the productive labourer, and thereby compelling every able-bodied individual to work for a living, the only base for class rule and oppression would be removed." (*Speech at the 7th Anniversary of the International.* In Collected Works-11, page 634, Moscow 1986).

* **The question of 'the productive forces'**:

Many working class intellectuals misunderstand what Marx said regarding the development of the productive forces. They take his statements out of context and misinterpret them as if Marx endorsed an endless development of the productive forces. In Capitalist system, the productive forces develop madly and dangerously due to the competition among the capitalists. The socialist order will begin only after Capitalism has developed to some extent. When the developed productive forces are readily available, what is the need for the enhancement of these forces further and further? In some context, Engels says that even if the productive forces stop at this level of development, they would suffice.' (I could not find this quote that I jotted somewhere.)

In fact, there will be a natural limit for any 'development'. The height to which a specific Neem tree can grow at a specific location is determined naturally. The physical dimensions of an animal or a person, such as the height or weight, are limited naturally. The amount of food needed for a stomach is limited naturally. What is the natural

limit for the development of the productive forces? The size of the population is that limit. Then, should there not be a natural 'limit' to the develop-ment of the productive forces? The development of the productive forces should be such that it would not destroy the Nature and damage the health of human beings. If it exceeds such limits, we have to stop or reduce such development of productive forces.

* **The abolition of 'the commodity production'**:

As long as the commodity production exists, the competition and profit will remain the driving forces. The needs of the society alone must govern the production of the goods and their use.

> **Engels**: ".....this industrial revolution which has raised the productive power of human labour to such a high level that – for the first time in the history of humanity – the possibility exists, given a rational division of labour among all, to produce not only enough for the plentiful consumption of all members of society and for an abundant reserve fund, but also to leave each individual sufficient leisure so that what is really worth preserving in historically inherited culture – science, art, human relations is not only preserved, but converted from a monopoly of the ruling class into the common property of the whole of society, and further developed." (The Housing Question, page 26, Moscow 1975)

* **The abolition of 'the exchange value (money)'**:

When the system of the commodities disappears, and the selling and buying cease to exist, then, where is the need for the money? Why is the money needed? When there exist no exchanges, there exist no calculations of exchange, do they? Marx explains how the abolition of the 'money capital' should commence at the beginning of socialism. This is not about abolition of money.

> **Marx**: "In the case of socialized production the money-Capital is eliminated. Society distributes labour-power and means of production to the different branches of production. The producers may, for all it matters, receive paper

vouchers entitling them to withdraw from the social supplies of consumer goods a quantity corresponding to their labour-time. These vouchers are not money. They do not circulate." (*Capital-2*, page 362, Moscow 1974.)

'Abolition of the money capital' does not mean immediate abolition of all the money calculations. In the socialist system, the abolition of the money capital is possible only when the means of production do not exist as private property! We must assume that all the means of production are in the possession of the State. In such a system, for the production in one branch of production, the means of production will be supplied by another branch of production. There will exist the calculations of the value between departments but not the money payments. That is how the abolition of money begins according to Marx.

* **The abolition of the value calculations and 'the use value' perspective**:

When producing a commodity, a capitalist initially makes an estimation of the means of production and the workers needed for the making of the goods. He does so from the use-value perspective. Capitalist who gets shirts made will estimate how much of the cloth, thread, buttons, tools, workers and working hours are needed to make one hundred shirts in a day. Thus, he will take into account only the 'use value' calculations. Only after this, he will calculate the amount of money required as 'capital' to make these shirts. However, only the use value calculations, not of Capital, are essential for the making of the 100 shirts. The products (shirts) can be made without the money calculations.

What is necessary for the farming of a land of one hundred acres? What is necessary to construct a building of two stories of specific dimensions? For the making of any object, we need the estimates of only two aspects – (1) the estimates of the means of production and (2) the number of the producers who give their time for the given production. There is no place for money in this process. There won't be any problem in

the case of planning due to abolition of money.

* **The abolition of the caste, religion, and the exploiting culture**:

The caste and religion are the products of relations of exploitation. The castes had originated from the differences in the manual and intellectual labors as well as property relations. Religion is the result of the traditions supporting the superstitious culture in matters related to Nature and selling the faith (devotion) like a commodity and secure profits.

According to Marx, it is human beings who created the religion. This means that the religion is not a natural phenomenon unlike the sun and the moon. As with any evil, we ought to discard also the caste and religion. Only after destroying the foundation that created the ideology and tradition, only then, will this change be possible.

Art: Marx and Engels argue that artists must perform other kinds of labour besides practicing their art.

> "In any case, with a communist organization of society. there disappears the subordination of the artist to local and national narrowness, which arises entirely from division of labour, and also the subordination of the individual to some definite art, making him exclusively a painter, sculptor, etc.; the very name amply expresses the narrowness of his professional development and his dependence on division of labour. In a communist society there are no painters but only people who engage in painting among other activities." (*The German Ideology*, page 418, Moscow 1976)

This condition applies to all of the art forms. Artists also must perform some labour.

Morality: Every class has its morality. Forcing other human beings into slavery is the morality of the slave master in a slave society. The real moral of all the exploiting classes, however, is the money. For the brothel-keeper, making money through the business is a great morality. Renting out her womb is the morality for a woman. Selling his semen and scattering his progeny around is

the morality for a man. Kidnapping is a smart morality. Above all, the wars of plunder of the continents are the highest and valiant form of morality. Immorality is the real morality for the exploiters!

Opposition to exploitation will be the real morality in the communist society. Equality and humanity will be the natural morality!

* **The abolition of the wage system**:

The existence of the wage system implies the existence of the Master-Labourer relations. The same situation will prevail even at the beginning of the Communist society as well. When there are differences in the tasks performed, there will be differences in wages! When the differences in the tasks disappear, and the values of all the works become equal as a result of radical transformation of the capitalist division of labour, where is the meaning in the wage system? (We must understand this point in detail. These few sentences are not enough.)

It will not be possible to abolish the wage system right at the beginning of the communist society. The wage system will not cease to function either in the beginning or in the middle but will disappear only when all other things are abolished.

Even not abolished yet, the Nature of the communist wage will not be the same as that of Capitalist system. We must presume that when the producers work for five hours in the communist society, the value of four hours will take the form of the wages and the rest that of 'the social fund'. (This issue can be seen in detail in my *'Introduction to Marx's Capital'.)* Given that the Nature of the wages will change in the communist society, we must find a new name reflecting the new character of wages. The term wages have other names such as salary. Can we call the communist wage a wage? We should not. In a similar way, the wage is not an acceptable name. First, the name of the wages should change. Finally, the whole system of wages should vanish! Gradual introduction of 'freebies' will finally lead to abolition of wages.

Marx: "...if we strip both

wages and surplus-value, both necessary and surplus labour, of their specifically Capitalist character, then certainly there remain not these forms, but merely their rudiments, which are common to all social modes of production." (Capital-3, page 876, Moscow 1974)

Marx: "At the same time, and quite apart from the general servitude involved in the wages system, the working class ought not to exaggerate to themselves the ultimate working of these everyday struggles. They ought not to forget that they are fighting with effects, but not with the causes of those effects; that they are retarding the downward movement, but not changing its direction; that they are applying palliatives, not curing the malady. They ought, therefore, not to be exclusively absorbed in these unavoidable guerilla fights incessantly springing up from the never ceasing encroachments of Capital or changes of the market. They ought to understand that, with all the miseries it imposes upon them, the present system simultaneously engenders the *material conditions* and the *social forms* necessary for an economic reconstruction of society. Instead of the *conservative* motto: "*A fair day's wage for a fair day's work!*" they ought to inscribe on their banner the *revolutionary* watchword: "*Abolition of the wages system!*" ….. Trades Unions work well as centers of resistance against the encroachments of Capital. They fail partially from an injudicious use of their power. They fail generally from limiting themselves to a guerilla war against the effects of the existing system, instead of simultaneously trying to change it, instead of using their organized forces as a lever for the final emancipation of the working class that is to say the ultimate abolition of the wages system." (*Wages, Price, and Profit*. In Selected Works-2, page75. Emphasis added. Moscow 1973)

* **The end of the 'State Authority'**:

In the absence of the hostile classes and the resultant

contradictions originating from these relations, the human beings can live responsibly and work freely without any ruling authority. In the absence of the hostile contradictions, there will be no need for the police, batons, prisons, armies and the like. The processes of production and reproduction; leisure, learning, arts and study of Nature will go on.

> **Marx**: "The condition for the emancipation of the working class is the abolition of every class, just as the condition for the liberation of the third estate, of the bourgeois order, was the abolition of all estates and all orders.

The working class, in the course of its development, will substitute for the old civil society an connection which will exclude classes and their antagonism, and there will be no more political power properly so-called, since political power is precisely the official expression of antagonism in civil society.

Meanwhile the antagonism between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is a struggle of class against class, a struggle which carried to its highest expression is a total revolution. ……..

Do not say that social movement excludes political movement. There is never a political movement which is not at the same time social." (*Poverty of Philosophy*, page 151-2, Moscow 1966)

> **Engels**: "As soon as there is no longer any social class to be held in subjection; as soon as class rule, and the individual struggle for existence based upon our present anarchy in production, with the collisions and excesses arising from these, are removed, nothing more remains to be repressed, and a special repressive force, a state, is no longer necessary. The first act by virtue of which the state really constitutes itself the representative of the whole of society — the taking possession of the means of production in the name of society — this is, at the same time, its last independent act as a state. State interference in social relations becomes, in one domain after another, superfluous, and then dies out of itself; the government of

> persons is replaced by the administration of things, and by the conduct of processes of production." (*Anti-Duhring*, page322, Moscow 1975)

The Anarchists demand the immediate abolition of the state. Regarding this demand, Marx and Engels explain that when the classes still exist, abolition of the state will not be possible and that the state will wither away naturally when its need disappears.

In addition to the abolition of important social aspects, there will be abolition of several other things.

For example: The abolition of the night shift. In great detail and with elegant logic 'Capital' describes the origin of the night shift, and what kind of agony is nightshift for the working masses, and how night shift represents exploitation. No word on this aspect appears in the documents of the Communist parties.

'Capital' also discusses the abolition of several heinous exploitative practices such as piece-work and part-time jobs.

'Would it be possible?' – This is a question of ignorance. Did anyone in the past imagine about the disappearance of slavery? Did any one believe that the rule of the kings would vanish? Questions such as these are irrelevant. We need to understand things by looking at the history. We must first debate, regarding any change, whether the 'change is logical'. 'Whether or not the change would be beneficial to the human society' – we must debate and understand. If the change turns out to be justified and beneficial to the human society, then, we can prepare a roadmap on how to bring about the change.

'No, not possible,' - one should not come to an instant conclusion as soon as the words about the abolition of the night shift fall on the ears. We must come to a conclusion only after debating this matter - whether or not the abolition would be necessary, and if necessary where it should be necessary. When it is clear that a certain kind of abolition is 'revolutionary', then, we must explore the path. If one generation cannot achieve, a later generation will achieve that change. To think and debate is our responsibility! ★

43. Marxist Theory of Knowledge (Marxist Epistemology)

Knowledge is a part or branch of Philosophy. Nevertheless, knowledge is not inferior to Philosophy. What all we know through Philosophy, it is knowledge.

It is the theory of knowledge or Philosophy which discusses questions such as 'How do people acquire knowledge; what are the means of acquiring knowledge; are there limits to knowledge?'

To answer the question, 'how do people acquire knowledge?', we must not take into consideration adults of 25 or 60 years of age, but an infant just born, or an infant older by a few days, weeks or months. When the infant opens its eyes and starts to look in all directions, and begins to recognize the mother who feeds and cares for it, that stage will be the stage of the beginning of knowledge. When the infant grows to the stage of crawling, and observes the plants growing in the backyard, the birds perched on the trees, the flowers, the sky casting over the tree tops, the clouds and the stars glowing in the sky, and begins to recognize a tree as a tree, a bird as a bird and a flower as a flower – that would be the second stage of knowledge. As the infant continues to grow in age, the stages of understanding Nature will increase accordingly.

Additionally, many subsequent stages of understanding are the means of conferring knowledge on the person one after the other in a succession - such as the household, the people residing in the house, the people outside of the house, the tasks all the people in and outside the house perform, the behavior of the people, the relations within the household, the relations outside of the house, and growing further, understanding the matters studying from the school books,

and the matters of learning from the happening in the outside society – all of these stages.

The initial disposition of the infant would be the disposition of the people who raise the infant – this will be the disposition available to the infant, and this is the disposition or the initial knowledge that the infant will acquire first. In the subsequent stages, the initial knowledge could consolidate further or undergo a transformation depending on the conditions of rearing.

In the natural knowledge (intuition?) of animals only Nature, not the society, exists. For the human beings, however, both Nature and the society exist. A person will get the knowledge of Nature from Nature and the knowledge of the society from the society.

Nature or society can display only the outward images but not the inner essence. Although many facts of Nature do not appear outwardly, some of these facts at least can be visualized and understood.

In Nature, what we see on the surface is that the sun revolves around the earth. In fact, it is the earth that revolves around the sun! We need natural sciences to reveal this truth.

Likewise, on the surface, what we can see is that the earth is flat for hundreds of miles on. In fact, the earth is a globular object! And, it is floating in a vast and empty space!

Similarly, the water flowing in a river is a dilute, chilled, and palatable liquid. But, if you look into the water, it is a blend of two highly inflammable gasses! If we can peep into the gasses further, there will be many more facts hidden inside of them.

We, however, do not need scientific experiments to understand everything visible in Nature. There is nothing enigmatic about the chilled water that fills a deep hole in the earth. We can directly see that the rain water seeped into the earth and got collected in the deep hole. There is nothing more intrinsically factual in this matter. That means, when some facts in Nature are not openly visible outwardly, some others are visible.

In contrast, in the society, in the contemporary society of the hostile classes still continuing, none of the real facts appear outwardly. A fact, however grave the fact may be, will not

reveal itself. In any social relation, what appears outwardly and what happens in reality are two different things!

A 'slave' is a human being, and a slave master is another human being. The two are fellow human beings. This is the actual fact. The social reality, however, is that the slave-human being is the property owned by the Master-human being!

In a similar way, all the lands are the property of the landlord! This is the outward fact! But the actual fact is that the landlord has nothing to do with the land. This is the fact not known outwardly!

The land rent, interest, profit, and the unproductive expenses – all these are the portions of others' labour secured by means of exploitation! But, what appears outwardly is that these portions are the sacred property rights of the owners!

The family relationship between a woman and a man appears outwardly a 'sacred relation'. In essence, this is a relation of a master and a female slave! In terms of Nature, the physical distinction between the male and the female is for the purpose of reproduction. In the absence of this need, this difference is not necessary. This difference is a natural property. In the society, however, all the facts are topsy-turvy. The women become inferior and the men superior. Not only the men but also the women fail to understand what is wrong with this assumption! In order to understand this, one needs not only knowledge about Nature but also about society. If such knowledge is acquired, women will realize the need for the struggle for self-respect. All the relations in this society are full of contradictions including the relationship between the mother and the children!

Thus, in a society based on exploitation, what appears outwardly and the inner essence are not always being the same. Because the appearance and the essence do not coincide, we need the aid of the social sciences to understand the truth.

As the human society exists within Nature, the human beings need the knowledge about Nature as well as the knowledge about the society.

Since the childhood to the time of death, every human being holds some opinion and understanding regarding Nature and society. This collective understanding will be the knowledge of that person regardless of whether these opinions are true or false! The opinions of every person are his or her disposition! When the opinions and understanding of different people are different regarding the same issue, it means that the philosophies and the sciences of knowledge are different in that society.

In a society where the people are divided into different hostile classes and groups, each class will have its own Philosophy. And, each section within a class will have its own knowledge. When ten different philosophies and ten different social sciences exist and attempt to define the same society, all of them cannot be true. All of the philosophies are likely to be untruthful and at the most only one of them can be true.

The real question regarding 'nature':

Is there a creator?

'Exists', says Idealism.

'Does not exist', says Materialism.

'Why bother about it? We don't know about it', says Agnosticism.

If 'his existence' is real, then, 'his non-existence' cannot be real. On the other hand, if 'his non-existence' is real, then, 'his existence' cannot be real. If one of the two ways of thinking is not conclusive, then, the third way of thinking which says, 'We cannot understand', will be true.

But, according to Materialism, anything that 'exists', must be proved regardless of its name. Matter will have the properties of matter, not the supernatural qualities surpassing its own properties. Any entity not accessible to proof or reasoning does 'not' exist, at least until a time such proof is available. If there exists a reasoning that such proof is 'not accessible forever', then, it means that the entity 'does not' exist!

At the outset, we have known that Marxist Philosophy is Materialism. Marxism follows 'dialectical Materialism' which consists of certain proper and logical principles according to which all the phenomena in Nature and society are inter-

connected and all the issues must be understood with reference to the time and context and changes take place due to intrinsic contradictions of the phenomena. (My argument is that the Hegel's principle, according to which, development and constant changes take place in the quality' must be rejected.)

Although Marxism is Materialism, it is not a science that explains the phenomena of Nature. Marxism, however, concurs with every factual description of the natural sciences.

Marxism is a revolutionary science that explains the social relations historically.

The important questions regarding the 'society':

Why in a society there exist the rich-poor distinctions? Why there exist the master-worker relations? – These are the important questions regarding the society.

The following is the Marxian perspective regarding the society – that there exists a process in the history of the society, that all the changes that have been taking place since the primitive stage are due to material causes and that the transformation of every social phase is due to the intrinsic and hostile contradictions.

Proper understanding regarding 'society' did not exist before Marx. At that time, there was no logical order to think about the society. Marx could develop a proper logic to understand the society by grasping the fact of exploitation of labour. One has to understand the 'classes' to understand the society. To understand the classes, one has to understand the phenomena of 'value' and 'the surplus value'. If we understand that the value means 'labor time', it amounts to understand the concept of value as a material fact and not an imaginary one.

According to the bourgeois economics, the value of the commodity is not connected with the commodity. The cause lies outside of the commodity. The value of the commodity is based on the whims and fancies of the people selling and buying the commodity (on their thinking). By showing the thoughts of the sellers and buyers as the cause of the value of the commodity, the bourgeois economics assumes

the form of the 'Idealism'. This is the level of the bourgeois economics even to this day.

In this backdrop, Marx grasped the correct material reason underlying 'value' (that the labor time is value). By understanding 'the surplus value' and the hostile contradictions between classes, Marx could grasp the history of the society from the perspective of the Materialist principles.

For the bourgeois historians, 'history' is only a collection of isolated and unrelated events that occur without a cause, order, or principle. These events happen only due to the whims and fancies of the people! How are these whims and fancies formed? What is the Materialist basis for these whims and fancies? Such questions do not occur to bourgeois historians. Must they answer such questions, except 'class distinctions', they will find numerous other reasons.

Since the grasping of the surplus value did not happen before Marx, the attempt to understand the human history from a logical perspective also did not happen before Marx. By defining the economic matters, the Marxist Philosophy explained the other social phenomena.

The question regarding 'the rich-poor' distinction is as fundamental to the society as the question regarding 'the creator of the universe' with reference to Nature. Why are some people rich, and some others poor? And, some are masters and others servants? No correct answers were available to these questions prior to Marx. Even those intellectuals who were genuinely upset by the fact of poverty and servitude failed to grasp the real reason.

> **Marx**: "…. the whole of human servitude is involved in the relation of the worker to production, and all relations of servitude are but modifications and consequences of this relation." (*Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844*. page-73, Moscow 1974)

Consider any 'unequal' relation in the society – racial inequalities, caste inequalities, regional inequalities, or gender inequalities – all of the inequalities are born out of the inequalities in the production relations.

Why should we consider Marxism as a Social Science?

This is because it is Marxism which discovered and disclosed the phenomenon of exploitation of labour. Also, Marxism is the only way to understand the process of history.

The exploiters, however, have their exploitative philosophies and exploitative economics, according to which, there cannot be production without 'capital'.

The reasoning of the exploiters proceeds as follows – 'For people to live there must be production. For the production process, there must be a capitalist and capital. There must be the land. To sustain them all, there must be a land rent for the land, and interest and profit for Capital. Without these incomes earned, where from the land and capital will come? Therefore, although the previous societies underwent a transformation, Capitalist society will not change. Without Capitalist system, there won't be any one who will get the production done. Without Capitalist, the people cannot live. Therefore, Capitalist system alone is necessary'. This is how they argue. Intellectuals such as Smith and Ricardo too thought along these lines.

For Capitalists, 'Capital' is not 'the means of production' but 'money'. Even Ricardo who understood that 'value is labor' did not realize the fact that the interest and profit have nothing to do with labour. To sustain themselves, the workers produce objects. They produce the means of production and the means of subsistence. This is what happens under the control of Capitalist. If all people work and produce all the necessary products, what is the need for Capitalist? Where from did Capitalist get Capital? If 'money is labor', how did Capitalist get so much of money? Marx understood all this.

The exploiters, however, do not agree with these facts. They defend their own claims. According to them, must the human society exist; it can exist only as a capitalist society. That means, according to the Philosophy of Capitalists, the master-worker relation is eternal! The riches and poverty, the prisons, gallows, and wars - all of them will be there forever!

In this ignorant world, Marxism, empowered with novel wisdom, transformed the meaning of every aspect. 'Capitalist

society must not exist. The human society can exist in happiness and peace without Capitalist system,' ascertained Marxism.

In a world engrossed with the wrong perception of 'one capitalist thought and one capitalist Philosophy for all the human beings,' Marxism emerged as 'the proletarian Philosophy' and 'proletarian theory of knowledge' owing to its unique and revolutionary Nature.

To refer to people as 'human beings' while discussing the social issues is only to make the class distinctions among the human beings invisible; nothing else.

The exploitative Philosophy which says that all human beings are equal invariably beholds the differences in the caste, religion, color, and race amongst these very human beings. Capitalist Philosophy changes its colors according to the need.

According to Capitalist Philosophy which recites the slogan that 'all 'human beings are equal', all the people are one. All Capital is the national capital! Wealth is national wealth! Income is the national income! - As if that capital belongs to all the people, as if all the people toil for that wealth and as if the income reaches all the people!

When the society is a class society, every aspect contains the class Nature.

In a 'class society,' everything is of two kinds!

Economics is of two kinds!

Philosophy is of two kinds!

Every theory and every knowledge are of two kinds!

The natural sciences are also of two kinds! The way the sciences are used and the way their benefits are secured are of two kinds.

The education, medicine, ethics, and psychology – all are of two kinds.

Since all the countries are class societies, the exploitative Philosophy of all the countries promotes the faith in God and mystifies the riches and poverty as natural phenomena – in an identical manner.

However, when the class struggles rage in some countries with great intensity, the leaders of the other countries paint their philosophies in modern embellishment to reduce the influence of the class struggles

on their own working classes. The leaders of such countries recite such terminologies which immerse their working masses in illusion and deceit! The exploiting classes that never uttered the terms such as 'socialism' and 'egalitarian society' would now add these terms to their philosophies. The interpretation of these words is, however, quite different. These interpretations do not mention the word 'labour'.

★

44. The Marxists who are Unconcerned with Marxism!

The Marxist theory of knowledge is a science that defines the human society from the Materialist and historical perspective. Only through Capital, that exposed the secret of exploitation of labour; we can understand what Marxism is.

Some Marxists, however, without touching Capital, without learning alphabets in Marxism, believe themselves to be Marxists and reciting the word Marxism. Some people in the communist parties, not only the ordinary members but also leaders, do not consider that Marxism is a theory that must be practiced with a sense of responsibility.

There are a few issues that have always surprised me:

1. A clinician, a deputy to a leader of a communist party and an intellectual who chronicled the biographies of communists; he once asked me if 'there existed the surplus labour in the slave society' and 'if Marx said so.' He even argued that Marx did not say so.

2. A highly positioned leader of a communist party said that 'to think that one gains knowledge only by reading Capital is petty-bourgeois arrogance.'

3. A big leader belonging to a communist party and the Revolutionary Writers' Connection', once wrote in a postal card. 'Did Marx say that in the communist society money would disappear and there will be no need for money? I haven't heard of such a wonder.' He is a very nice person otherwise.

4. Look at Mao's statements in chapter 35 of the present book! He argued that he cannot accept the idea that the communist society will not undergo any changes. 'Do you think even after a million years, communism will remain the same?' He questioned. If the human society remains after a million years, will the society not have the same needs at that time as we have now? Will they not need food, clothes, and a house at that time too? Will they not produce these necessaries of life those days as we are doing today? Should not the production relations be based on equality in those days as well? After many millions of years, if the human beings are still existing, will they or will they not need food? If they need food, they need to perform labour. Will not the need for communism in relations of labour—that is, a need for equality—be the same any time as it is today? Will the people stop eating in the future? If the people in the future stop eating food, in such an event, there will be no need for communism - unlike us feeling the need for it today.

5. 'In our country, the classes have disappeared. There are no more classes.' How is this kind of statement of Stalin regarding Russia? The working class leaders who were able to seize the State power are so backward and so haphazard. Hence, they encouraged their own personality cult instead of understanding 'the revolutionary theory'.

Is there room for personality cult in a theory that must understand 'relations of equality'? Does a human being, who fails to understand how lowly is an act of promoting personality cult, deserve to be called a human being?

Thus, We find no traces of 'the theory of Marxism', in the communist parties, either in the past or today. The parties of many countries, including those of Russia and China', have abandoned 'class struggle' and embraced 'class collaboration'.

'What remains to be done is to understand the surplus value and the historical Materialism discovered by Marx and to elaborate their details,' noted Engels, didn't he? The parties of today and their leaders instead have been 'improvising'

class struggle into class collaboration.

6. 'What is money?' Those people who haven't studied Capital will not be able to answer this question appropriately in the least. 'Whose is the money?' To this question, perhaps some people might answer that, 'the money belongs to the workers.' But if we ask them, 'Which workers?' there will not be an answer anymore. Else, they may give a wrong answer, 'Which workers? All the workers.' We will acquire the real knowledge only by studying Capital, not by hearsay.

In a society, everyone will have money big or small; even the children will have it! Money may not necessarily belong to those people in whose hands it is present. All the money comes from 'the labor of the productive workers'. In other words, money is only an element that can exchange the labors of the productive workers. The Unproductive workers also perform work in the employment of their masters; they lose 'the surplus labor', not 'the surplus value'; they are subjected to 'exploitation of labour'. They take the wages as money. Nevertheless, the money falling into their hands is not their own labor that has been transformed into money. Since the Unproductive labors cannot transform into money, there will not be any component of the Unproductive labors in the total money of the society. All of the money only comes from the productive labors. One must study Capital to understand such important matters.

7. According to Marxism, the production relations form the 'Foundation' (economic structure) of the society. All the other spheres make the 'Superstructure'. Although there exist interconnections and mutual influences between the two components, the influence of the Foundation on the Superstructure is primary than the influence of the Superstructure on the Foundation. Some Marxists fail to understand, or do not agree with this point. 'The foundation and the superstructure have equal influence on each other; the influence of the foundation is not fundamental,' they argue. All the Identity movements proceed along these false arguments. If the foundation

and the superstructure both have an equal influence on each other, what will happen when both influences each other equally? These two components will not be able to change each other. When these two spheres are equal, the impact of the components on each other will be balanced. Even if the two spheres change into one another, a foundation and superstructure of identical Nature will emerge again. In other words, when two spheres have equal degree of influence, the net outcome will be nil! When the influence of one of the two elements is superior, the superior element can influence or suppress the other. When the foundation of the production relations is exploitative in Nature, all the elements of the superstructure will acquire a character in accordance with or corresponding to the exploitative Nature.

The influence of the superstructure can never acquire a character that can transform the Nature of the foundation. The foundation will change only when the working masses realize the Nature of the foundation and having grasped this reality when these masses wage struggles towards a change; only then a change in the Nature of the foundation will begin and progress to transform gradually. The ideas, about a component that has to change, must undergo change first.

Many Marxist and non-Marxist intellectuals, who participate in the activities related to the foundation as well as the superstructure, do not understand such a simple point;

8. Some Marxists make utterly irrational arguments regarding the man and woman relations (Gender relations). 'To expect that a woman should have a relation with only one man represents the old time feudal culture. If this remains the same in the communist society too, how can it be a better culture?' some people wonder.

Not only for women, but also for men, this ideal (of one man and one woman) would be a rational culture. Unless the man and woman relation starts with a mutual interest and based on the monogamous tenet of 'one woman and one man', what meaning does 'fatherhood' have? Every child

will know who the mother is but if the father is not known, will it not be a relation of contradictions? Gender relations should be based on the equal rights for both men and women.

'The sciences have developed enormously. We can identify the father of the child by doing a DNA test,' would be the solution of the intellectuals who follow the false bourgeois arguments. For these intellectuals, how the relations between the parents of the child must be formed is not important; their solution is to chase all the men who are absconding after the birth of the child and discover who the father is. In other words, according to these scholars, we must blend the bourgeois licentious conduct and the bourgeois sciences and rename the concoction as 'the communist culture'.

9. The bourgeois feminists and the communist party folks mesmerized by these feminists are not concerned with the division of labour in terms of 'House-work and Outside-work'. A woman clinician returning home after performing her job outside has to do all the household chores as an obligation. (She will hire a domestic help; that is a different matter.) The bourgeois feminist gems would contend that the household women must be paid wages. Who must pay the wages? A person earns 'wages' only by working for a Master. Else, when that person makes a few objects and sells these objects, he or she may earn a wage and some profit as well. The labor of the household women does not enter into an exchange (sale). Even if the husband of the woman is considered to be her Master, the domestic relation is not similar to that with an outside Master.

Then, how will the money come to the household woman and in which way? Those people who argue that the husband or the government must pay the wages to the women cannot understand the futility of their arguments. I have written a book on this topic '**House-work and Outside-work**' from a Marxist perspective. Unless we realize that the division of labour perpetuating between women and men over thousands of years must transform into an

equal division of labour, namely, '**House work for both and outside work for both**', we cannot solve any problem in this relation.

10. A few Marxist intellectuals offer a solution to the contradictions embedded within the exploitative division of labour perpetuating since the ancient times. 'The choice of the work is one's individual right. Regardless of it be a manual task, intellectual task, or any other kind of task, the wages must be uniform. Then, regardless of the Nature of the work people do, all will be equal,' they propose. We must first note that the people who make such propositions know nothing about 'the law of value'. When they are not aware of the basic point, all their arguments will become meaningless. If all the jobs have the same wages, why will anyone take up the job of sweeping the roads? He will choose a job wherein he sits in a chair and do his work. Or he may choose some such work. If the wages are uniform for all the jobs, then, there will not be people available to do certain kinds of jobs. As a consequence, the wages are bound to become different. All these differences are due to the differences in the values of different kinds of labor. Even small children will laugh to hear that all kinds of jobs should have uniform wages.

> **Marx**: "... as the costs of producing labouring powers of different quality differ, so much differ the values of the labouring powers employed in different trades. The cry for an *equality of wages* rests, therefore, upon a mistake, is an inane wish never to be fulfilled.....Upon the basis of the wages system the value of labouring power is settled like that of every other commodity; and as different kinds of labouring power have different values, or require different quantities of labour for their production, they *must* fetch different prices in the labour market. To clamour for *equal or even equitable retribution* on the basis of the wages system is the same as to clamour for *freedom* on the basis of the slavery system." (*Wages, Price and Profit*. Page- 208, In Selected Works, Moscow 1970)

11. Lin Piao, the Communist leader and the

defence minister of China, once observed that China has been transformed into a socialist nation and hence does not need Capital anymore. The Ultra-left trend that he represented went to the extent of endorsing the view that "individuals should not work unless they feel like it." [Requoted from our Telugu translations of **Charles Bettelheim**'s works: *China Since Mao*, page-202; *Cultural Revolution and Industrial Organization in China* (foot note: 84).]

All these examples show how ignorant are some of the communist leaders in certain theoretical issues and how they are intoxicated with bourgeois thinking. Those were the leaders who undertook great expeditions to seize State power.

12. 'Who is a worker?' No working class intellectual knows this. Any person working for a Master for a specific period and takes a wage is a worker. (That person may have other means of income. That is not relevant here.) The teachers and clinicians working in the employment of the public or private sector all are workers. No teacher, however, considers himself or herself a worker. No clinician considers himself or herself a worker either. In the perception of these intellectuals, workers are the ones who sweep the roads, who drive the trucks, who till the land, and the like; only those who do the lower grade manual jobs.

Although Marx primarily referred to the workers who performed manual labourers ("**the worst paid labourers**"), he also referred, depending on the context, to the workers of the intellectual jobs. The intellectuals fail to understand this. They do not consider themselves to be workers.

Since the people who managed to ascend to the level of the intellectual tasks do not consider themselves workers, they lack the perspective of the trade unions, communist parties or even the sense that this is an exploitative Nature of the society.

Will these workers so unconcerned with the theoretical knowledge be able to achieve communism? Are these workers and the party leaders revolutionary heroes who will achieve communism by getting rid of the system of commodity production?

Marx, therefore, defined the working class as the one filled with '**the muck of all ages**'. He said further that it is the revolutionary responsibility of the proletariat to get rid of that muck.

'To which class do I belong? To which group in the class do I belong?' Every person in the society must ask this question and consider his or her position. A human being, if indeed a human being and not an animal being, must know his or her position in the society.

I, writing this text, am not a worker working for any Master. My work is an independent labor. I am an independent worker writing books. I am also an independent worker (not having an owner) selling my own books. The sale of my books is, however, not for making money, only for losing money. I hope to convey to the readers (through books) what I learnt from Marxism. Every person in my family is an intellectual worker employed with an owner and earning a wage.

Shall we see why Marx observed that the proletariat is filled with 'the muck of all ages'? ★

45. Proletariat with 'muck of all ages'

[**We** can see in this chapter how the Proletariat (the working class) acquires knowledge about Nature and society. Originally I wrote this chapter in my '*Introduction to Marx's 'Capital'*. I have added few introductory paragraphs to this chapter while reproducing it here in this book.]

The existing society is filled with all undesirable qualities which have been inherited and accumulated over ages beginning from Primitive, Slave, Feudal and Capitalist systems. The working class ought to change such a society into a New Society.

If we eliminate exploitation of labour, it will be the New Society. If all persons perform labour for their living, it will be the New Society. If we change the age-old relations of exploitation it will be the New Society.

Such a society, however, does not emerge on its own. Whichever class requires a path

of liberation that class, namely, the proletariat ought to initiate the action. Therefore, the entire population which now (after the action of the proletariat) performs labour will have to build a New Society in a phase-wise manner.

But the working class which was born and grew through exploitative societies, it also inherits all the evils of the past societies ('*muck of all ages*'). Thus the working class too is tainted with all evil qualities. Yet, the Working Class has a special quality, namely, 'performing labour'. It is a class that lives on its own labour. This class which is subjected to exploitation of labour has to come out of its bad qualities in order to liberate itself. Therefore, if the working class does not change itself, 'Communist society' will be a falsehood. Marx observed that the working class inherited 'muck of all ages'.

'Existence of classes' as 'classes' is one thing and the 'consciousness of the classes about their existence as classes' is another thing.

When we say 'consciousness', the consciousness merely at a 'common sense' level is vague. Due to this kind of consciousness, only outward things will be intelligible but the entire truth will not be intelligible.

When 'science' also accompanies common sense, even the consciousness will give new meanings and the whole 'truth' will come out.

Even after the revelation of the secret of 'classes', the labouring class is still at the common sense level. It is one thing to hear certain isolated words like 'Marx', 'exploitation' and 'Communism' is one thing and it is another thing to know theoretically that they have been losing their 'surplus labour' to the exploiting class since generations under specific names and thus they have been in existence as a class.

The labouring class has been away from this knowledge since generations.

Ignorance about 'Nature',

Ignorance about 'society'.

This is happening so because whatever knowledge the labouring class receives is nothing but what the 'class of owners' teach it. All the means that disseminate knowledge, especially, education, arts, all other cultural media are

under the control of the class of owners with that class character. The labouring class does not have the means to receive knowledge without reference to the class of owners.

> "The ruling ideas of each age have ever been the ideas of its ruling class."—Marx & Engels (Manifesto of the Communist party, page72, Moscow edition.)
>
> "The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas: i.e., the class which is the ruling material force of society is at the same time its ruling intellectual force. The class which has the means of material production at its disposal, consequently also controls the means of mental production, so that the ideas of those who lack the means of mental production are on the whole subject to it. The ruling ideas are nothing more than the ideal expression of the dominant material relations, the dominant material relations grasped as ideas; hence of the relations which make the one class the ruling one, therefore, the ideas of its dominance."—Marx & Engels (The German Ideology, page67)

The class of owners is the ruling class. The ideas of the ruling class are the ruling ideas. The very ideas of the class of owners are the ideas of the labouring class.

The knowledge which receives through the class of owners is:

In the case of 'Nature': God in relation to Nature; and disgusting and horrible superstitious notions in the daily life!

In the case of 'society', the lands and properties of the owners are those which their forefathers gave. Later, the owners worked very hard with their intelligence and raising their properties. Our forefathers did not give anything to us. Hence, we are poor. This is how it goes on.

Whatever the class of owners say, the same thing is repeated!

"In the society, everything is of two types. Economics is of two types. Philosophy is of two types. Everything is of two types"- These observations, which we made earlier, exist simply at a theoretical level. It does not mean that these two types exist in the daily life. There are no different economics,

different Philosophy and a different way of thinking in the lives of the labouring class. Except the knowledge which the class of owners transmits, the labouring class does not have any other kind of knowledge.

The labouring class has to learn that 'different' knowledge afresh.

The majority of the labouring class does not yet know in a correct way what their class theory, Marxism, says.

The labouring class does not know that 'wage' is merely 'value of labour power' but not 'value of labour' and that 'rents, interests and profits', which go to the class of owners, are nothing but their 'surplus value'.

It does not know that all the means of production are part of its past surplus value and that no class should have the ownership right over land.

It does not know that the State (government) which is ruling them, protects 'exploitation' and any State could exist only as a class-state.

It does not know that it is living in (wage-) slavery under that class of owners and it has no independent life.

While manual labours and mental labours take place in a 'production process', the workers who perform mental labour do not think thus, "we are doing mental labour; other laborers are doing manual labours. All of us constitute the same class". The people who perform manual labours also do not know this fact with clarity.

The labouring class does not in fact know what a 'labouring class' is and what its constituent sections are.

The mental labourers like teachers, doctors, lawyers, engineers and scientists do not know that they are also living in (wage-) slavery under the class of owners. They know one chunk here, another chunk there, and nothing more about Marxism. They simply know that 'Marxism' is a theory of communists but they do not know that it is a theory that tells truths about classes and that they are also part of the labouring class.

While the situation of mental labourers is like this, it is needless to talk about the manual labourers.

If the labouring class, which is in such a situation, wages 'class struggle', it would

undoubtedly be a sequence of defeats.

The labouring class, which was also in the same situation in the past, was able to succeed in its class struggles in the past because those struggles could only change the form of class slavery and they were not intended to eliminate exploitation. Hence it was possible to succeed though the class did not know about 'exploitation'.

But, here, it is not the case. We have to eliminate exploitation itself. We have to drag the non-labouring class into labour. We have to build New Society involving revolutionary changes. To accomplish all this, the labouring class should be aware of its class theory! It should wage its struggle knowingly!

To wage this struggle, it is not enough if the labouring class go against the class of owners with the strength of the guns. More importantly, it has to go with 'theoretical strength'. If it goes simply with the strength of the guns, it can easily succeed, just as one king succeeds another, because the labouring class is in large numbers. This is the first step only. The entire struggle that should take place will come only later. The actual struggle involves 'building of the New Society'. If the labouring class does not have the 'knowledge of the class theory', it would build again Capitalist society, thinking that it is building the New Society; at the most in a slightly 'modified form'! It (such a society) won't develop the 'class knowledge' of the labouring class at all. It would gradually increase opportunities for the exploiting class, which is ready in a disguise to pounce upon. On one fine morning the half-baked New society will again emerge as the old capitalist society without any disguise. Thus, the entire struggle, which the labouring class until then waged knowingly or unknowingly, cleverly or stupidly, will go waste.

Therefore the most important condition for the successful onward march of the labouring class in its class struggle and for the uninterrupted building of the New Society is that it should receive the entire knowledge about 'exploitation'! That is, it should know 'Marxism'!

It should come out of Capitalist

ideological sphere in every smaller or bigger issue with a clear-cut aversion and grasp.

The 'good quality' that the 'labouring class' has is 'doing labour'. This itself is its specialty. If we take out this specialty and put it aside, the labouring class possesses all the 'bad qualities' that the class of owners has because it is the class of owners, which decides the lifestyle of the labouring class. The kind of products that the labouring class consumes, its ideas, its pastimes and everything is a decided by the class of owners. The labouring class will not have its own life style with special values. What the labouring class does is to 'imitate' the life style of the class of owners.

The working class performs labour not because of its realization that performing labour is the responsibility of human beings. It is because it does not have property by which it can earn interest or profit for living. It performs labour because it does not have any other means of living except working. The workers too wish to have property and live on the income secured from that property without doing any work. The workers too hold such views because they have to work very hard in order to live and also because they are unaware of the fact that living on incomes like interest and profit is exploitation of others' labour. Because of such situation, the workers will have such false consciousness.

If we observe how the influence of one class would be on another class, we will find that the class of owners will not get spoiled under the influence of the labouring class. If the influence of the labouring class is on the class of owners, the class of owners will learn some labour and will become somewhat good and it will not lose anything. But it is not the same case with the consequence of the influence of the class of owners on the labouring class. Owing to the vices of the class of owners, labouring classes will inevitably learn all those vices under the influence of that class. It will first learn mainly laziness and tendency to evade labour. Along with it many kinds of vices!

Just as the class of owners behaves in a discourteous manner

toward the labouring class, so also each section in the labouring class behaves in its own discourteous manner toward other sections within its own class.

The mental labourers do not behave with courtesy and a sense of equality toward manual labourers.

The male workers do not behave with courtesy and a sense of equality toward woman-workers.

Even the woman-workers do not behave with courtesy and a sense of equality toward other workers, who are at a lower level than them and toward the domestic workers, if they engage some.

The woman-workers and male workers do not behave with delicacy and affection toward the child-labourers at the work places.

The labouring men and women do not behave with courtesy and a sense of equality toward their aged parents and other aged people.

Whichever section is placed at a higher level and possesses some extra rights compared to another section within the working class, it won't agree to give up its rights and authority.

All this is 'muck' that the labouring class acquired from the class of owners! This muck is not limited to one year or one generation. It is the muck that has been accumulating since the days of slavery!

Along with the existing ignorance in all aspects, the labouring class will be immersed in many kinds of vices such as: frauds and tricks of the class of owners; false values at every step; attitude to exercise authority over fellow human beings wherever possible; craze for fame in their own possible ways; attaching value everywhere only to 'quantity' rather than 'quality'; rudeness; stupidity; insincerity; addiction to vices; unkindness, cruelty and thirst for blood towards animals and humans and so on.

This does not mean that every individual will have all these vices. There will always be a difference between one person and the other. If we consider the class, it will, on the whole, have all these vices.

The reason for all this may be the class of owners; may be exploitative society. But, the point to be grasped here is that

the labouring class too is not a '*heap of good qualities*'.

Though the labouring class has got dislike and disdain to some extent toward the class of owners, it will have more fear and respect toward the riches, wealth, level and exhibitionism.

The 'master' does not at all feel shy or show hesitation in the presence of labourers. He stands proudly as if he is a person with great intelligence and great efficiency and he is maintaining the labouring people.

The manual labourers hesitate and show obedience. The Intellectual labourers too does the same.

For labourers, everything connected with the class of owners appears to be 'great'.

Market affairs, prices, banks, exports and imports, stock exchanges, foreign exchange — all these topics which the class of owners talk are 'great' in the view of labourers. It is because, all these things take place without any connection with and knowledge of the labouring class.

Labourers show much more reverence and attention towards the 'highly educated' owners. "He studied at Harvard", "He studies in London", "He studied in New York", "He studied at Cambridge"-these expressions will make the labourers surrender much. What did he study there? Did he study about exploitation? Did he study that exploitation should continue or should be done away with? Did he study 'how to eliminate exploitation'? He studied none of this. He studies exactly the opposite of this. That is, he studies that exploitation should continue. He also studies how to continue it. He returns after studying management courses of how to exploit workers further and further. The entire secret of 'higher' studies is only this! Should the labouring class respect fellows who study these things? Let those highly educated fellows studied any number of courses, let them study anywhere, let them possess any number of degrees and let them wear any number of medals, the labourers should have a sense of strong rejection in their hearts and they should not at all take note of such highly educated persons.

The same thing happens in the case of 'heads of the governments'. Ministers, Chief

Ministers, Prime ministers, Presidents and all such persons appear to be the 'most powerful' persons to the labourers. But who are they? They are merely exploiters and/or the representatives of the exploiters! They are simply commodity bargainers and money calculators! They have no greater values than this. What appears to be their power is not their power, it is the power of the 'Capital'! All that appears to be the power of 'Capital' is not that of Capital; it is of the 'labour'!

On the whole, the entire power owes its origin to 'labour'! Since such labourers are in ignorance, they cannot realize their own capacities; moreover the fellows who do not have any capacity appear to them as the most powerful.

Therefore, labourers should not at all attach any value to such words as: 'They are rich! They are great! They are educated! They are knowledgeable! They are intelligent!

Just as an atheist does not at all care the religious preacher, so also labourers should not care the bourgeois education, bourgeois intellectuals, bourgeois leaders and bourgeois theoreticians! Further, intense anger should always burn like a fire in the hearts of the labourers against 'bourgeois Nature'! But their ignorance does not give them such strength.

The labouring class, due to its ignorance, puts its trade unions in the hands of bourgeois leaders who are not connected with 'labour'. It feels happy by watching the leaders receiving titles (like '*shram ratna*', '*udyoga ratna*') for the labour which they never performed.

Likewise, the labouring class harbours lot of illusions on bourgeois political parties and the governmental schemes.

The 'labouring class' feels happy as soon as it heard the news that the government undertook such and such scheme for the 'eradication of poverty' with 150 crores. But, whatever be the Nature of that scheme and even if the government leaves it to the responsibility of the labourers, the wages fixed there are 'value of labour power only'. No scheme pays 'surplus labour'. Hence no scheme will eradicate poverty. Even to understand such a minor issue, one has to know about exploitation. When the labour class does not have such knowledge, it will surrender to

reformism or false policies that reemerge in newer forms.

Marxism is not meant for Capitalist class. Capitalist class does not receive that theory. It is meant for the 'labouring class' only. Thus, Marxism is the theory of the labouring class.

The question, however, is how properly the labouring class follows that theory. The labouring class, which is under the influence of wrong theories, may follow Marxism sometimes properly and sometimes wrongly.

When it follows properly, theory and practice become one and the same. When it does not follow properly, the two become different.

To call Marxism 'theory of the labouring class' does not mean that however and whatever labouring class practices, it amounts to Marxism. If 'the labouring class' commits mistake, it is not the mistake of 'Marxism'.

If the 'labouring class' commits mistake, the same mistake is not Marxism.

Likewise, whatever the 'organizations', 'the political party', or 'the government' of the labouring class does, it is not Marxism.

As Marxism is rational and as it defends 'labouring class', it does not mean that the labouring class too has all the good qualities and rationality, which Marxism has.

When we say 'labouring class', it is not equivalent to Marxism. Similarly. Either a 'party' or 'government' of the labouring class cannot be equivalent to Marxism simply because they took those names. It does not mean that those organizations (party or government) have the correct consciousness to defend the interests of the labouring class.

Similarly, 'class struggle' means, it is not simply a struggle waged against the bourgeois class. It is also a struggle which the labouring class wages against itself. That is, against the bourgeois Nature that is present in itself. Against its false consciousness that hurts itself!

When we speak of 'building of Communist Society', it is not merely the bourgeois class that has to change. Before that, the labouring class has to change. Each section within that class has to change. Mental labourers, manual labourers, women, men, children, adults and every one should change. All people have to get rid of their vices, which they have been accumu-lating

since the past and since progress from one stage to another.

Since the labouring class has been behaving in accordance with the relations of exploitation for generations together, the labouring class too requires anti-exploitation regulations against its past servile psychology and false conceptions.

The labouring class has to struggle against the 'muck of all ages' under the influence of the exploiting class.

All this is part of the 'class struggle'. All this is part of the anti-exploitation struggle. Through such struggle, the labouring class has to make itself fit for the new revolutionary life.

> "Both for the production on a mass scale of this communist consciousness, and for the success of the cause itself, the alteration of men on a mass scale is necessary, an alteration which can only take place in a practical movement, a revolution; the revolution is necessary, therefore, not only because the ruling class cannot be overthrown in any other way, but also because the class overthrowing it can only in a revolution succeed in ridding itself of all the muck of ages and become fitted to found society anew."—Marx & Engels (*The German Ideology*, page-60)

'Knowledge of capital' is the primary condition for the organization of the movement.

If those who read 'Capital' recall what ideas they held before reading it, they will realize that they held many wrong notions earlier. Those 'wrong notions' would remain as they are if they did not read 'Capital'.

It is the same case with the labouring class. If the labouring class does not receive the knowledge which 'Capital' gave, it would terribly lag behind theoretically. It will be completely drowned in the exploitative theories.

In September 1868, the conference of 'International Workingmen's Association' was held at Brussels. A resolution was passed at that conference as follows:

> "Workers of all countries should study Capital and that efforts should be made to have it translated into the various languages."*(Karl Marx: A Biography,* page370, Moscow 1973).

★

46. 'Existence' determines 'Consciousness'

[This is also from my 'Introduction to Marx's 'Capital', but slightly modified.]

The total male and female population in a capitalist society may be divided into those living in different conditions. They are:

1. Productive labourers.
2. Unproductive labourers.
3. Exploiters, who do not perform labour at all.
4. Exploiters, who do not perform labour to some extent.
5. Independent producers.
6. Family members who do their own house work.
7. Unemployed people + People in the orphanages + People in the jails + People in the religious institutions.

Every person in the society exists in any one of these situations. However to make our example simple, we have to reduce these 7 kinds of existence into 2 kinds only: 'Masters' and 'Labourers'. Those (either male or female) who do labour connected with their own families are labourers because they do not live without doing any labour. Except exploiters and some persons connected with religious institutions, all people are working class people. Therefore, it is not wrong to divide the entire population into two categories.

'Existence' is the place a person occupies in labour relations. 'Consciousness' means the ideas or views of that person. The statement that 'existence determines consciousness' means that the ideas of any given individual depend on the conditions (or place) in which that person is located. The primary distinctions within the conditions of human beings, namely, masters and labourers, apply to any exploitative society.

The master considers himself as a superior person, as a dominator and a person who is not obliged to do any labour. All his ideas in every aspect will be in accordance with his existence as a 'master'.

The labourer considers

himself as some body who has to be subservient to the master, who is obliged to do whatever work the master assigns to him and that the aim of his life is to obey the orders of the master. The ideas of this person will be in accordance with a condition called 'servitude'.

Had the labourer, right from the beginning been in the situation of a master rather than that of a labourer, then his ideas would be characterized by masterhood. Similarly, had the master been in the situation of a labourer, then his ideas would be characterized by servitude.

It means that the ideas an individual holds with reference to human relations or other social conditions depend on the place he occupies in labour relations.

However, when we speak of 'conditions of existence' and if the conditions involve contradictions, the ideas that spring up from that existence too involve contradictions. This is how it happens: Slavery is a condition of existence. But it is not a natural condition. Male-female distinctions between human beings is a natural condition. But existence of human beings as slaves and slave masters is not natural. It is a condition that harms the slaves. Therefore it creates ideas opposed to slavery. While the ideas that slaves have to be subservient to the master exist predominantly, the ideas that are opposed to subservience too would inevitably exist at some level. Both these kinds of ideas arise from the same condition of existence called 'slavery'. These two types of ideas emerge from the conditions of slavery and not from elsewhere. This means, favourable as well as opposing ideas arise from given conditions of existence that involve contradictions.

However two different types of ideas will not form in the case of Masters as it happens in the case of slaves. Because, the condition in which slave masters live, is beneficial to them (the Masters). They entertain only those ideas that uphold their existence.

When a relation between human beings involves contradictions, a change opposing such a relation begins from the party (side) which suffers due to that relation.

When ideas favourable to

oppression are losing their impact and opposing ideas are on the rise (how this happens is a different point), the opposing ideas alone will change that condition of existence.

A Slave will have both favourable as well as opposing ideas with reference to the condition of slavery.

However when opposing ideas developed and adequately, those ideas would become new ideas. Those new ideas would change the old situation. This means Ideas are determined by existence. It follows that there is an influence of new ideas on the old condition (existence).

This means that, just as the conditions of existence influence ideas (consciousness), consciousness too influences the existence! Here, influence of ideas does not mean the influence of ideas that favour given conditions of existence. There won't be any change in the conditions of existence due to ideas that favour those conditions. Only opposing ideas alone can change those conditions of existence.

These opposing ideas do not emerge from elsewhere independent of the existence. They too emerge from the existence. Hence, when we say 'existence determines consciousness', it implies that the opposing ideas are included in the Consciousness itself. It is slavery which forms the basis of the opposing ideas as well. Just as ideas are formed due to existence, existence will change due to one part of those ideas.

Though slaves are not aware of 'exploitation of labour', they wage struggle in many ways against the masters due to the sufferings in their daily life. Those struggles keep changing their conditions of existence to some extent.

Classes have been changing in this manner.

At a stage when human beings were not clearly aware of the fact that they were formed into distinct classes, the consciousness of both the classes about the distinctions would be ambiguous. There won't be much distinction between the ideas of the Master and those of his Labourers. Same is the case with capitalist society as well. Both think alike with reference to Master-Labourer relation.

Capitalist thinks like this: "Labourer works and I give away wage to the labourer for doing the work. I get profit because I invested 'capital'. What can I do if the labourer is in poverty? Propertyless people will be like that!"

Labourer thinks like this: "The wage that I receive is the remuneration for my labour. The profit that Capitalist gets comes from the 'capital'. I am able to live because my master is giving me work. What can the master do? I don't have property and hence I am in this condition".

Both sides (Capitalist and the Labourer) think alike. Master-Labourer relationship appears Natural to both the classes. Because exploiting class alone rules the entire society in Exploitative societies. This means it is the class of Masters that rule the Working class. The ideas of the class of masters will be the ideas of the workers. Whatever the Masters tell it is the knowledge for the labourers.

In Marx's words:

"The ruling ideas of each age have ever been the ideas of its ruling class" (Marx & Engels. 1848. *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. Page-125 in Marx & Engels: Selected Works, vol.1, Moscow edition 1973)

"The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas: i.e., the class which is the ruling material force of society is at the same time its ruling intellectual force. The class which has the means of material production are on the whole subject to it. The ruling ideas are nothing more than the ideal expression of the dominant material relations, the dominant material relations grasped as ideas; hence of the relations which make one class the ruling one, therefore, the ideas of its dominance. The individuals composing the ruling class possess among other things consciousness, and therefore think. Insofar, therefore, as they rule as a class and determine the extent and compass of an historical epoch, it is self-evident that they do this in its whole range, hence among other things rule as thinkers, as producers of ideas, and regulate the production and distribution of the ideas of their age: thus their ideas are ruling ideas of the epoch" (Marx & Engels: 1845-46. *The German Ideology*. Page 67, Moscow edition 1976).

★

47. Contradictory Philosophies

[This chapter is also from my 'Introduction to Capital', see how varied logic is and who argue in what manner and why they do so]

Exploitative Philosophy (another name is 'untruth')	**Marxist Philosophy (another name is 'truth')**
(1) There have been two types of people in society since the past: people who are lazy (idlers) and people who are economical. While idlers became 'poor', people who were economical became rich.	(1) It is true that there have been two types of people in society. But they are not people who are lazy or economical. The exploiters and labourers! Only labourers became poor and exploiters became rich.
(2) Anybody will have the right to accumulate private property. Whoever has 'capacity' he can accumulate.	(2) 'Capacity' means ownership secured forcefully over the 'means of production'. If it is the property formed due to 'self-labour', then it will be enough only to satisfy necessaries of life. If property accumulates over and above that level, it is possible only through exploitation. To say this metaphorically 'property is theft'! When we say 'property', property of self- labouring people and property of the exploiters are not the same. "Political Economy confuses on principle two very different kinds of private property, of which one rests on the producers' own labour, the other on the employment of the labour of others. It forgets that the latter not only is the direct antithesis of the former, but absolutely grows on its tomb only." —Marx (Capital, vol.1, p.716)
(3) People will not be 'enthusiastic' to do work if there were no 'private property'.	(3) Was all that labour, which slaves performed, for their 'private property'? Is the labour, which workers are now doing, for their private property? Why are they working without having any private property? All the properties of the owners are their properties, aren't they? Then why don't the masters have enthusiasm to do work? Why is their own property not making them enthusiastic?

(4) The 'State' protects law and order. It saves from the enemies.	(4) True. The 'State' of the exploiting class protects the law and order of the exploiting class. It saves the exploiting class from its enemies; that is from the 'labouring class'.
Which means, the class-state does not function for the two classes.	
(5) We can't say about the past societies; but at present, capitalists and workers are equal.	(5) No. This society is also another form of the past societies. This relation is also a relation of exploitation; a relation of master and servants. This is also a faulty social relation.
(6) 'Selfishness' is in the very human nature.	(6) Firstly, it is wrong to talk about human beings as a whole. Humans are 'class humans'. What is the selfishness of a slave? What is the selfishness of labourers? Is it to pour-out the largest part of their labour free to the class of owners and serve it day and night? The entire 'selfishness' is that of class of owners; not of all the human beings.
(7) Human beings are 'bad people' by nature. They commit crimes.	(7) The basis for the crimes and badness is exploitation only. Exploitation itself is a big crime. All the crimes arose for the sake of economic and political interests of exploitation. All the criminals have been formed due to the exploiting class only. Some of the crimes, which the labouring class commits, are for the sake of livelihood; some are due to the influence of exploiting class. Human beings, at the time of their birth, are neither good nor bad. Only society make them good or bad. If crimes and evil are present in the society, it means that the society is in the state of great blunder! For those to whom exploiting society appears as 'eternal', all its features too appear as eternal features. Criminal activity and evil nature appear to be eternal and natural features of human beings. But it is not true.
(8) Fair distribution of 'national income'.	(8) System of extracting 'surplus value' from the 'labouring class' should continue! Rents, interests, profits and every thing should continue as they are! The entire exploitation should go on as before! But, a 'fair distribution' of national income! 'Fair'!

(9) Economic issues depend on politics.	(9) No. Politics will have some 'goal': either to sustain the economic foundation or to eliminate it. Politics are necessary for this objective only. Hence, politics depends on economics, but not that economic issue depend on politics.
(10) The poor should get 'justice'! We have to 'serve' the poor!	(10) The very existence of the 'poor' itself is 'unjustified'! Justification for an unjustified situation means keeping the poor as they are and others do 'justice' for them. Governments in the service of the poor; Clubs in the service of the poor! The voluntary organisations also in the service of the poor! All are in the service of the poor! These are the fellows who create the poor! They are not concerned with the 'why' of poverty. The poor have been doing labour to you since generations. In future, they will still do greater service for you. They will throw you from the 'throne of the masters' and do the service of making you real human beings.
(11) Don't reduce human life to the 'level of economy'.	(11) Yes, Marxism also tells the same. It also says, 'human relations should not be like money relations'! To achieve this, Marxism has a theory and a programme of action as well. But you don't have any such thing. All that you have with you is the programme of 'increasing money by means of money'. On the top of it, parrot-like talk and fake morals: 'don't reduce human life to the level of economy'! According to you, money is eternal! Money-exploitation is eternal! Money relations are eternal! But, ours is the theory that really rejects 'money'; that is 'Marxism'!
(12) There should be no restrictions on the freedom of human beings.	(12) Human beings are of two types. Exploiters want freedom to exploit. This is their meaning of freedom. But, labourers argue that no one should have the freedom to exploit; they don't want such a freedom even for themselves. This is their meaning of freedom. Hence, freedom too has class-nature. Whether it a big issue like 'exploitation' or a trivial issue like 'growing nails', one cannot have his/her freedom. When a person is living along with other persons in society, his/her freedom be such that it should not harm others (society). If a person says, 'my nails are my pleasure' and grows long nails, then every →

→ one will have the freedom to catch that person and cut his/her nails. It is necessary for the protection of the health of the society as well as self-protection. This is the meaning of freedom.	
(13) Lower classes are now changing. Consider so and so person belonging to the lower class of the so and so country. For example, take **Ambedkar** of India. How much has he progressed!	(13) The progress of one individual is not the progress of the total class. Moreover, progress which **Ambedkar** attained was not a real progress. Ambedkar, whose origin was of the lower class, knowing about Marxism, opposed Marxism and hence helped the capitalist class rather than the labouring class. "The more a ruling class is able to assimilate the foremost minds of a ruled class, the more stable and dangerous becomes its rule." (Capital, vol. 3, pp.601).
(14) The capitalists act as trustees of the properties. The workers work hard like patriots (this is the summary of trusteeship theory of 'Mahatma' Gandhi, the modern Indian philosopher).	(14) Why? Why shouldn't the workers act as trustees and why shouldn't the capitalist work hard like patriots, Mr. 'Mahatma' Gandhi?
(15) "I will be born as scavenger if at all there is a rebirth"- Mr. Mahatma Gandhi.	(15) Why wait until the next birth? Why do you waste this 'birth' by postponing the 'good deed' until the next birth? Why don't you begin it during this birth only?
(16) Under socialism, the king and the peasant, the rich and the poor, employer employee all persons will stand at an equal level — Indian philosopher, Mr. Mahatma Gandhi (socialism of my conception, p.1)	(16) Under the 'socialism' of Mr. Gandhi, there will be kings, rich-people and employers on the one hand and peasants, poor people, and labourers on the other hand as before! But all persons will be at an equal level! In what respect do they stand equal? Well, we don't know. Mr. Gandhi has not elaborated it. But, Mr. Gandhi was obliged to introduce words like 'equal status' and 'socialism'.

(17) Landlords should donate their surplus land for the sake of poorer classes. Vinoba Bhave, the philosopher of Land-donation movement.	(17) 'Surplus land'! 'Surplus' means? Some thing that remains after landlords retain as much land as they want! Will the family of the landlord cultivate the land, which the landlord retains? If the agricultural workers cultivate that land too, wages and surplus value will be as before! How will Land-donation movement solve this problem?
(18) You should not ask, 'what the society has given to me', rather you have to think, 'what have I given to society'?	(18) The society, which always extracts from the 'individual' always preaches such sermons. Wherever there is 'taking' there should also be 'giving'. The person, who questions himself thus, "what have I given to society" will have the right to question thus, "What has the society given to me?" A society, which always takes but does not give anything, will not give anything, will not do any good to individuals. If the individual is for the society, the society is also for the individual. There should not be contradictions between the individual and the society. The two are not different. The 'good' of the two is the same.
(19) All the religious books talked about the welfare of all the people. Look at 'Bhagawat Gita'! Read 'Bible'! Take a glance at 'Quran'! "sarvee janaa sukhinoobhantu" (Let all people live happily!), said our elders.	(19) True, they said so! What did the religions books say as to why all people are not happy now and why some people are unhappy? Did they show 'exploitation' as the cause? Did they tell the solution to change the society so that all people will be happy? Did they suggest 'class struggle?' Did they say a single enlightened word to change the real lives, except to bow down in temples, churches and mosques? Will all people become happy by simply saying so? Don't the religious books know the commonsensical thing that 'prayers don't bring down a fruit you have to pluck it?'

(20) Class struggle is violence.	(20) Before saying so, the exploitation class should abandon all its weapons. It has to abolish its police, courts, prisons, military and everything. It is the exploiting class, which kept all the weapons. It is the exploiting class alone that has been resorting to unimaginable violence since ages. Violence is meant to suppress the labouring class. It is not violence to revolt against the violence. It is a struggle for self-protection. It is the right of the labouring class to liberate itself. If the exploiting class realises this right of the labouring class and voluntarily gives up its exploitation, there will neither be struggle nor violence. It is the exploiting class, which is responsible for violence right from the beginning.
(21) If masters are relieved of the work of management, they can study 'philosophy' — **Aristotle.**	(21) Well, then, when should the workers study philosophy? If masters also get into the work along with the workers, working time for all will decrease and then all people can study 'philosophy'. Isn't it?

Thus, philosophy of each class argues in favour of its respective class. But, truth cannot be of two types. Though the exploiting class change the truth in any number of ways for its class interests, the 'actual truth' is one. It is the theory of labouring class. It is the philosophy of the labouring class. That is, Marxism.

"The philosophers have interpreted the world in various ways. The question, however, is to change it"—Marx.(Theses on Feurbach' in "The German Ideology", p.620).

The theory that can eradicate exploitation blossoms the real and natural human characteristics in the human society.

"...communism, as fully developed naturalism, equals humanism, and as fully developed humanism equals naturalism; it is the genuine resolution of the conflict between man and nature and between man and man....."— Marx. (Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844, p.90)

48. Need to see few more issues!

When we reread any of the writings of Marx and Engels — even though we have read it before attentively — we feel as if new expressions and new ideas have now appeared afresh. "Did I not see this before? Did I not read this before?" we wonder. I have felt that way a few times.

Look at these words:

> **Marx:** "The question then arises: What transformation will the state undergo in communist society? In other words, what social functions will remain in existence there that are analogous to present state functions? This question can only be answered scientifically, and one does not get a flea-hop nearer to the problem by a thousand-fold combination of the word 'people' with the word 'state'." (*Critique of Gotha Programme*, page26, Moscow 1971)

If we combine the terms 'People' and 'State' and call it "people's state" will the old characteristics of the old state disappear in this new one? If there was military in the state of exploiters, it will be there in socialist state as well. But military in a socialist state will exist to defend socialism against wars waged on it. If there were prisons in old state, they will exist in the socialist state as well. They will exist to put away the people who conspire against socialism. That means, it is not that when "people's state" comes into existence all the old characteristics of the old society will disappear immediately. In fact, if the concept of 'people' exists, it means there is a 'ruling institution' as well. If there is a 'state', all its apparatuses that exist with it are there for its class struggle. Hence, it does not mean that when we speak of 'people's state', all the characteristics of a State will not perish.

We should understand various contradictions, and issues that exist in the society and discuss to obtain more information about these. Even though we hold the revolutionary working class ideas, if they are

incomplete, we get a feeling, "Alas! Is all this possible?" - If it is a 'miracle', it is not possible to make it come true. If it is something that is not a miracle and justifiable, and if it is necessary to make it possible for someone, then it is possible to make it come true. It is not possible to make it true if it is not necessary.

Look at the aim of working class struggle:

> **Marx** and Engels: "While the democratic petty bourgeois want to bring the revolution to an end as quickly as possible, achieving at most the aims already mentioned (The demands of petty-bourgeois democracy), it is our interest and our task to make the revolution permanent until all the more or less propertied classes have been driven from their ruling positions, until the proletariat has conquered state power and until the connection of the proletarians has progressed sufficiently far – not only in one country but in all the leading countries of the world – that competition between the proletarians of these countries ceases and at least the decisive forces of production are concentrated in the hands of the workers. Our concern cannot simply be to modify private property, but to abolish it, not to hush up class antagonisms but to abolish classes, not to improve the existing society but to found a new one." (*Address of the CC to the Communist League*, March 1850. Page-178-9 in Selected Works-1, Moscow 1973)

Hostile classes do not disappear by just laying foundations to the new society. Thereafter, several changes should take place gradually. We should discuss and elaborate what Marx and Engels have stated.

> Marx and Engels: "If man draws all his knowledge, sensation, etc., from the world of the senses and the experience gained in it, then what has to be done is to arrange the empirical world in such a way that man experiences and becomes accustomed to what is truly human in it and that he becomes aware of himself as man." (*Holy Family*, page 130. In Marx & Engels, Collected Works, vol. 4. Lawrence and

Wishart, Electric book 2010.)

Even those people, who talk fondly about Materialism and who do not believe in superstitions in their daily lives, would have several shortcomings in their conceptions of Materialism. We have a nearer example of Mr. GoRa (Goparaju Rama chandrarao). Can anyone say that he is not a Materialist? Would it be a fact if someone says that? But even such a Materialist says that there is no relationship between man and Nature! [*In the Telugu original, there is a long footnote which analyzed Mr. GoRa's perspective on Atheism. The original writer felt it may not be of much interest for non-Telugu readers in this context.—Translator.*]

In the same way, many people who talk fondly about Marxism do not know what Marxism is. They keep saying, "Socialism, socialism". They do not know how many types of socialisms are there. They do not know how it is useful. They will have doubts and dislike for words like "class struggle." They say, "Marx and Engels might have said something like that in those days. Is it possible now? There are several new types of weapons with the government. Is it possible to fight those weapons?" They do not know that all those who make and use the weapons are also workers and that if those workers have proletarian outlook, waging struggles will not be a problem. In fact, it is because they do not know what exploitation of labor is they do not feel enough anger about exploitation.

In fact, did Marx and Engels talk about working class or about the entire population? - Many people are not aware of this. When Marx examined bourgeois economics and looked into what previous economists have stated, the aspect of 'surplus value of working class' was found. It came to light that, wherever there is a relationship between master and worker, in whatever form that relationship is, whether productive or Unproductive, it is a hostile relationship When master class honestly looks at Marx's discovery, understands the truth in it and agrees that, "Alas, has the master class been making such blunder since thousands of years?" and relinquishes its class position, then why would there be a

question of a struggle? But it won't happen that way. That is why Marx told working class to 'struggle'.

It is not that Marx had said so based on his own imagination or his own wish. All what Marx had found out was that if there is something called exploitation of labor it will make struggle a necessity.

Even though struggles had begun since the times of slavery, those past struggles did not occur to confiscate the means of production from the master class which occupied those means of production unjustly. That kind of struggle to confiscate means of production should start now.

When such a revolutionary struggle begins, and continue until the abolition of commodity production, entire population will live in non-hostile relations. That means, Marx mode of inquiry begins from the proletarian perspective, and eliminates the slavery in all aspects.

The communism that Marx talks about is not a separate ideal that has no relation with class distinctions. If it is a separate ideal it should be an ideal to all classes in an identical manner. But from the beginning, communism is not an ideal that everyone wishes for. In human society, there won't be ideals unconnected with human relationships. Any ideal does exist as belonging to some class or the other. Communism is the ideal of the liberation of the working class. But that path liberates all classes.

> Marx and Engels: "….the communist revolution…. abolishes the rule of all the classes with the classes themselves.." (*German Ideology*, page-60. Moscow 1974).

Did Marx and Engels talk about any stage subsequent to communism?

Nowhere did they say. Working class should make sure to eliminate hostile classes and hostile contradictions. Take a look at what Marx has said about the last stage where hostile contradictions exist.

> Marx: "The bourgeois mode of production is the last antagonistic form of the social process of production." (*Preface to 'A contribution to the critique of Political Economy'*.)

Both the individual as well as joint writings of Marx and

Engels indicate that disappearance of hostile classes and antagonistic contradictions - that is classless society - is the last and final form of human society. They do not say that even the classless society will change. If classless society has to undergo a change, it would mean that there will be hostilities even when there are no classes. Even before the classes were formed, there were hostilities in the primitive societies in the form of fighting between tribes. However, it is meaningless to say that even when classes have completely gone, hostilities will still exist. If hostilities still exist, it only means classes still exist.

According to Marx's explanation and logic, capitalist society is the last stage where hostile contradictions exist. If there is a country that exists in the name of 'socialism' and if there are similar issues and contradictions that were there in the old society, then it should be understood that is not socialism and that it is still a capitalist society with relationships of exploitation of labor.

Marx explains how a society looks like when class contradictions really disappeared.

> Marx: "In a higher phase of communist society, after the enslaving subordination of the individual to the division of labor, and therewith also the antithesis between mental and physical labor, has vanished; after labor has become not only a means of life but life's prime want; …….. Society inscribe on its banners: From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs!" (*Critique of Gotha Programme*, pages:17-18, Moscow 1971.)

We should not think that Marx talked about humans with so much love for people because he had a tender heart. There is so much reason in saying, "**From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs!**" I tried to give some illustrations in my Introduction to Marx's 'Capital' to show the logic in Marx's statements.

According to Marx if there is a planning in society ("conscious social regulation of production") that does not depend on money ("exchange value") calculations then it is a planning based on labor ("distribution of social

labour in definite proportions")

In his letter to Kugelmann on 11-8-1868, Marx makes some observations relevant to planning. He argues that in any country if people stop doing work for a 'few weeks', its population will 'perish'. Every society needs various kinds of products. Hence it should have a planning with reference to the amount of labour required for a given production and how many people in the population could perform that required labour. If there is a situation where private production and private exchanges take place, even then various types of labor should be arranged. But, in that situation it all happens in the form of 'exchange value'. That is the change in form of labor. Planning of labor is what should happen in any society. This is the meaning of Marx's words.

After imagining the relationships without classes and the highest level that Marx had clarified, try to imagine development beyond all that! How much new development is possible in that kind of relationships? - There is no need for that new development. That means, either in Marx's logic, or in the way we understand it, we can easily infer that there is no possibility for a higher level after communism.

What does the bourgeoisie say about Marx?

Do we even ask that question? Can't we imagine what the people who are addicted to exploitation would say about Marxism? They will say, "All that Marx has written is wrong". If they say 'what Marx has written is correct' instead of 'wrong', wouldn't their beliefs crumble? If they say that, they will also have to stand in front of the machines. They will have to sweep all the rooms in the factories. If all this is clear in Marx's writings, would these exploiters say "What Marx has written is correct?" Are they so noble minded?

Their economists are lowly than they (bourgeois) are. None of the bourgeois economists have opened their eyes even after the fact of 'exploitation of labor' has been exposed. Aren't their pockets heavy because of their service to the bourgeoisie? That is important for them. They will spoil paper only to find fault in Marx, in the name of

economics. Bourgeois economists are not intelligent enough to investigate about 'exchange value' and money. The intelligence of Bourgeois Economists is nothing but the market smartness of those who sell heaps of commodities.

At the time of selling and buying commodities they see only supply and demand. They say that it is the reason behind the 'price'. May be they were really naive before Marx's 'Capital' came out. Even after reading that literature, if they say that supply and demand is the reason for 'price', that shows they are not only cheating themselves but also others.

In fact, somebody who is an economist, should know that 'exchange value' is the total 'sum of old and new labor'. They should know - if the cost of previous labor is deducted from the money that comes from selling a 'commodity', the surplus money that remains is the cost of new labor. The money that came from new labor should belong to the new labor. All that is given as wages and all that is left belong to the new labor.

Just as needles, threads, baskets in production of commodities, play a definite role, is there any role for land-rent, interest and profit? In making of a shirt, would profit have same role as the needle? When a shirt is looked at as a 'commodity', 'profit' comes into picture. If a shirt is considered not as a commodity and with no concept of selling, but as something that is a thing of necessity, where would the role of 'profit' stand?

Even the modern economist writes that Marx's theory of value is wrong and that theory of surplus value is more erroneous and that all of Marx's writings are wrong. For the production of commodities, Capitalist, the managers, the technicians and many others are needed. Since production takes place only when all these people are involved, the entire labor is not done only by the person standing in front of the machine and hence the theory of value is wrong - this is the argument of the economist who wants to gobble up his share from the surplus value that capitalist gains from the workers.

In production of 'commodities',

every one other than Capitalist is a worker at a particular level. Everyone gets wages. After all that is paid up, there will be heaps and heaps of surplus value. That will belong to Capitalist. Portions of it goes in the name of land-rent, interest and profit. Also towards taxes and the Unproductive expenses.

'Economics' is of two types. Economics of relationships of exploitation is one type and economics of exploitation-free relationships is another type.

There are so many differences between the two, starting from the way Law of value is understood. The bourgeois economics doesn't have a concept of 'value'. No understanding that labour itself is value. When a commodity is sold, whatever money is obtained based on supply and demand that is the 'price' of that commodity! Rent for land, interest and profit for capital— all these should come from that 'price' - This is the economics that capitalists have formed for themselves!

But the bourgeois economics goes on in a way that Capitalists too do not understand. This is how it happens: The sum total of old and new labors needed for producing a commodity is the actual value of that commodity. But that value alone will not turn into price. If the profit rates of Capitals vary drastically from one branch of production to another due to competition among capitals of various branches of production, all Capitals will run towards those branches that give higher profits. Therefore, in order to reduce that problem at least a bit, Law of 'general rate of profit' comes into effect. It is the Law that reduces the differences in profit rates among various branches of production. For that, actual value becomes 'production price'. The commodity owner, at first decides the production price as the price of that commodity. Even then, there is no guarantee that the commodity will sell at that price. Similar kind of commodities will already be there in the market in heaps, won't they? Since there is no proper planning in production of that commodity, its supply and the demand for it differ. Hence, when the commodity goes to the market for sale, it's 'market price' goes higher or lower than the production price.

Sometimes it might not change. If there is deceit by the seller while selling the product, market price need not go up or down. This way, there are several stages between production of a commodity and selling of that commodity. At the end, surplus value is derived from the sale price. That is the surplus value from productive workers.

We need to consider the mass of all the 'commodities' produced in all branches of production in society as well as the sum of the market prices of those commodities. Then we will come to know that the surplus value from all sections of productive laborers. That will not include money from Unproductive labourers. This is what happens in reality which Capitalists do not understand and which is not included in their economics.

Just imagine that there are no modes of exploitation, no competitions among capitals, no variations in supply and demand, no cheating in business! Imagine that there is a planning in accordance with the needs of society and for production of commodities! If things are like that, for any commodity, there won't be any difference between 'actual value' and market price. Value itself becomes the price. This is how it happens: when there are no profits, and no competition among profit rates, value need not become production price. When there are no variations in the supply and demand, production price need not become market price. When there is no cheating in business dealings where commodities are sold, even that market price need not go up or down. When there is no exploitation, the commodity will be sold at its actual value, as price. This is the economics that we will find if we imagine that there is no exploitation!

It was not bourgeois economists who found out how bourgeois economics works in several stages; it was Marx, who was against the bourgeoisie. In his 'Capital', Marx showed the bourgeoisie, "Your economics works like this."

From economics, bourgeoisie understands only two things: supply and demand and profit rates. They say that those are the two important aspects that are in and should be there in

economics. Moreover they criticize Marx. "When it shows that price is set in market due to supply and demand, why does Marx disregard 'price' and talks about 'actual value'? The whole argument of Marx about value is wrong. In fact, the book 'Capital' that Marx has written is all wrong. He utters words 'Value', 'labor', 'exploitation' and so on. Is there a day that he doesn't teach all these wrongs to the workers?" - This is the argument of bourgeois economists!

And here is what bourgeois Philosophers say, "People should be told to be like brothers, should be taught the ways of peace. But why does Marx say Struggle, Struggle?" When we see some of the old and new bourgeois intellectuals who find faults with Marxism, we will know their criticism.

Gaetano Mosca: There are some criticisms made by this bourgeois intellectual in 1896. At one point of time, he was a member of the Italian parliament.

Here is a brief summary of Mosca's criticism of Marx from his book 'The Ruling Class' (1869): There is "pernicious and effective propaganda of destructive hate between the social classes" in the pages of Marx's 'Capital'. There is no factory worker or a farmhand who does not believe, or who has not been told over and again about Marx's dangerous doctrine of class hatred. Socialism is not possible since injustice results from ethical traits that are natural to human species. There is a "great danger" in Marx's theory of history because it mixes "the dangerous falsehoods with a certain amount of truth".

Karl Popper (He was a professor in England): He was a 20th century bourgeois Philosopher. He wrote a book in 1962 called, "The Open Society and Its Enemies". Bourgeois intellectuals call Capitalist society as "Open Society". That means it is a "society with freedom". They call the communist society as 'closed society'. It is the society that does not let in tricks of exploitation, keeps bourgeoisie at a distance, hence it is a 'closed society' for them.

The enemies that this book by Popper considers is, specifically Marx. This is an honor for Marx! Exploiters recognize their enemies quite

well. In fact, communists do not recognize their enemies well; they don't get as much angry as they should. They even like to look at the clamor of their elections of bourgeois parties. They wonder who will come to power, but do not think, "When we will come to power?"

Popper's book has put even Hegel in the list of enemies. Didn't Hegel say, "Society will develop constantly"? When Marx and Engels loved Hegel for saying that, this Philosopher hated him. Even this is in tune with Popper's thinking.

Popper's argument goes as follows: Readers need not take Marx's words seriously. Marx's 'formula' of class struggle is a 'dangerous simplification' because there are contradictions within both the ruling and ruled class. Marx's 'historical prophesy' of Classless society is false because there develops a 'new ruling class' consisting of revolutionary leaders together with their followers.

Raymond Aron, a bourgeois Sociologist, has written a book in 1955 called, "**The Opium of The Intellectuals**", against Marxism.

Marx calls religion an "Opium of the people". Hence this intellectual calls Marxism as "Opium of the intellectuals". Even this man is also an intellectual who writes books. But opium of Marxism did not get to him! He proved very well that Marxism does not work on Bourgeois intellectuals. There is a very good meaning in this. The intellectuals on whom Marxism does not work should be considered as bourgeois intellectuals. Just as we measure temperature with a thermometer, we should measure intellectuals with Marxism. It will be easy to find out who is in which class; if they have class knowledge, or ignorant about it.

There are many bourgeois intellectuals who despise Marxism. The three we have seen here are just three small specimens. Since the day Marx spoke about "working class struggle", from that day intellectuals of exploiting class have been criticizing Marxism. 'Peace' is what they want, Peace! Workers should first ask these peace mongers, "If you want so much peace, why does your government keep with it so many lakhs of weapons and armies?"

Every worker should tell the bourgeois intellectuals: 'We respect Marx as a revolutionary because Marx has the urge to punish the exploitative ruling classes.'

They should ask, 'Scientists like Galileo and Bruno did not talk about any politics, socialism, or economic issues! Why, then, did the ruling classes, which want peace, killed those innocents?"

The proletariat should say, "Marx knows all about the contradictions in ruling class and those in working classes. Even though there are several differences in the interests of the workers, Marx knows that each and every worker loses surplus labor. In all his writings, Marx showed all kinds of contradictions that exist in society. He did not hide anything nor did he misinterpret anything. When leaders of working class turn into bourgeoisie, same fight waged on bourgeoisie will be waged on those leaders as well. Even though one leader of the working class changes, lakhs of workers will not turn into bourgeoisie."

Didn't Popper say not to take Marx seriously? He does not need to tell this to bourgeois readers at all. They already know that they should not pay attention to Marx even if no one tells them. It should be told to workers only. That is what that intellectual tried to do. He was wishing to confuse the working class, by talking that way.

Confusion arises when we fail to understand what that intellectual is saying and with what outlook he is saying. It is not the bourgeois books that confuse the working class readers; it is the class collaboration of the communist parties! Some communist parties talk about bringing socialism through bourgeois parliament based on class collaboration. Those parties do not clarify how bourgeois parliament can bring about socialism and why bourgeois parliament will let it go on.

No need to think any more about what bourgeoisie say about Marxism. There will be two strategies with bourgeoisie. (1) Silence (2) Denying all what Marx says is incorrect and declaring that there is no exploitation.

Bourgeoisie keep heaps of weapons behind their backs and preach about peace.

Must read 'Capital'**!**

Why spend time on Philosophy?

While reading any book written by Marx and Engels, we feel like talking to them. It becomes easy to understand books on Philosophy only after reading 'Capital'.

We live not only in Nature but also in society. Materialism is needed not only for the Nature but also for the society.

Marxism is nothing but Materialism of the society. And '*Capital*' is the book that talks about it. We see hundred problems in a society. But, there will be one main reason for all those problems. Materialism of the society should move towards that main reason.

Whatever anyone has said in the principles of Philosophy, however great those principles are, if the concept of 'exploitation of labor' is not known from Marxism, there will not be even an iota of change by means of principles of Philosophy. If one principle of Philosophy says, "old things go away and new things happen. There will be development in society", would that create an outlook of socialism? Even if there is that particular principle of Philosophy, if the concept of exploitation of labor is not known, there will not be any movement in society. If the concept of exploitation of labor is known, even if the particular principle of Philosophy does not exist, movement in society does not stop. Change happens because reason for the problem is known, not because of imaginations of Philosophy. Even if there are no imaginations, there will be a solution for every problem provided we comprehend actual reasons.

Once the concept of 'exploitation of labor' is known, seeing the disappearance of slave society and receding in feudal society, if one says that "society is still developing", there is some meaning in it. However, without the knowledge of exploitation of labor, if someone accepts the rule of kings and says that "society is still developing", it only amounts to imagination. Moreover it is something to suspect. If Philosophy is made of individual and separate imaginations, there will not be any use to the people who face problems in the society. There should at least

some cause-effect relationship.

While religious Philosophers describe beauty of heavens, another kind of Philosophers describe "dreams about develop-ment in society." All are mere imaginations. In heaven, even though there is nothing for women, men at least can find alcohol and nymphs. In dreams that talk about development in society, it is not known what bourgeois will find and whether or not workers will find anything at all. 'Dreams about heaven', where at least a little bit is known seems better than the 'dreams about development' where nothing is known.

For Capitalist class there is no better development than capitalism. Its development must take place in terms of 'rate of profit'. If for capital of 100, if there is a profit of 200 instead of 100, it will be called development! If the profit further increases, there is more development. The development that this class wishes for, stops in the path of profit rate. For exploiting class, there is no other stage of development than the stage of capitalism.

But development of working class will not stop at capitalism. For working class, capitalist society that gives life of a wage worker is a better development than slavery, or life of a tenant farmer. However, the develop-ment that working class has obtained is a change in form but not development in true sense. This class, should develop to the extent of getting rid of the worker-master relationship. For that reason, communism becomes an absolute necessity for this class. That does not work for the bourgeois. It will become the task of bourgeois intellectuals and Philosophers to block the way to communism.

Even if they teach for many lakhs of years about universal spirit, Inner truths, Unity of soul with Supreme Being, imaginations about development, it will harm human society and to even exploiters, but no one can attain one ray of wisdom. Unless the secret of exploitation of labor is known, even if all the Materialist laws of Nature are known, it is not possible to get knowledge about society by means of natural sciences.

Philosophers always keep saying, "Humans, humans."

They consider humans, as one among the many kinds of living things that roam in Nature, based on bodily properties. Similar to calling ants as ants, goats as goats, they call humans as humans in the sense of biology. That means, 'they (humans) are not animals'.

Other than that, they do not see what kind of society humans are living in and what kind of historical relationships they are in. In the view of a Philosopher, a king is a human being and a slave is also a human being. Both are same. Any and every Philosopher considers a person as an aspect of biology and not as a social fact.

People in "human rights" organizations are all this kind of Philosophers. It does not appear that they understood the fact that along with their reformist activities, they should also know about history of society and the social relations.

At least some Philosophers can deduce laws of Nature from their imaginations, but not the laws of society. Society is not reachable just to imaginations.

Any law will become a law only after experimented on but not at the beginning of imagination itself. That is why Philosophy does not have as much value as sciences. Marxism is something that was born from investigations into the law of value and not from imaginations of Philosophy.

Laws of egg turning into chick are not needed to know that exploitation of labor should be fought against. It is not necessary to identify similarities such as 'since it is happening like that there (in Nature), it should happen like that here (in society). Knowing exploitation will lead to the fight against it. Exploitation is what should be known in the first place. Nature and society have their own form of knowledge. Each of them has its own use.

Marxism has become social science as it discovered the secret of exploitation of labor. It includes Philosophy as well.

If it is considered that, "master worker relationships are unnatural relationships that are harmful to one particular class", then there is not only economics in it but also Philosophy.

Both economics and Philosophy are present in the statement, "Each according to his ability; each according to his need".

> Marx and Engels: "...how absurd is the conception of history held hitherto, which neglects the real relations and confines itself to spectacular historical events." (*German Ideology*, page57-58, Moscow 1976)

How proper this understanding is! People who write history do not understand the kind of relationship that a king is in the history, they narrate the history like this: "That particular king is so valorous and brave! That king owned so many thousands of elephants, so many thousands of horses! That handsome king had eight wives and eighteen lovers. That generous king had that wall built, had that well dug" - they talk about history like this.

They say, "Had the wall built, had the well dug" but cannot say, "He built the wall, he dug the well". When they can't say "he built", at least they should say, "He made the slaves build the wall. He did not do anything."*

*To narrate history like this or to tell a story, one should know about the hostile classes which Marxism points out. Because of such awareness, it was possible for me to write, ***Ramayana, the poisonous tree***. Due to study of Marxism, it was clear to me that 'Rama and Ravana, both were kings; both of them occupied others' kingdoms with aggression; received services from the slaves; exploited other tribes and occupied their territories and shared kingdoms of others'

If it is not told that way, it is not true history. All the history books that we are reading as histories are filled with lies. Ours is the smartness where we go to look at the buildings which emperors got them constructed in the name of wives, and the lands which were wasted to construct those buildings!

When every person is able to live in a society with self-respect, self-protection, in happiness, in peace, without facing injustice and disgrace, then it means there is no difference between an individual and the community of individuals. Whatever is advantageous to an individual is advantageous to the community and whatever is advantageous to the community is advantageous to an individual. We should acquire smartness to imagine this kind of history.

Whose fault is it, if a ten year old Telugu girl who is in 5th class does not know how to read Telugu letters? - It is the fault of teachers who did not teach her! In the same way, whose fault is it if working people do not know Marxism? - It is the fault of communist parties who do not teach them. It is the fault of people who do not know why they have found those parties.

Marx and Engels were with limited knowledge about social issues, when they were below 25 years of age. They tried to measure their intelligence while reading Hegel and Feuerbach.

> Marx: we decided to set forth together our conception as opposed to the ideological one of German Philosophy, in fact to settle accounts with our former philosophical conscience. The intention was carried out in the form of a critique of post-Hegelian Philosophy. The manuscript [The German Ideology]……" (*A contribution to the critique of political economy*. Preface.)

No one is born an intellectual. At the same time, they do not become intellectuals just by growing up a bit. Whoever reads a bit, observes themselves, corrects themselves, learning something, will get to know appropriate things. Learning is not for someone else or for fame, but to better our thoughts.

There is a German Nursery Rhyme in 'German Ideology' (pages: 146-147).

The master sent out John
And told him to cut the hay;
But John did not cut the hay
Nor did he come back home.
Then the master sent out the dog
And told him to bite John;
But the dog did not bite John,
John did not cut the hay
And they did not conic back home.
Then the master sent out the stick
And told it to beat the dog;
But the stick did not beat the dog,
The dog did not bite John,
John did not cut the hay
And they did not come back home.
Then the master sent out fire
And told it to burn the stick;
But the fire did not burn the stick,
The stick did not beat the dog,
The dog did not bite John,
John did not cut the hay
And they did not come back

home.

Then the master sent out water

And told it to put out the fire;

But the water did not put out the fire,

The fire did not burn the stick,

The stick did not beat the dog,

The dog did not bite John,

John did not cut the hay

And they did not come back home.

Then the master sent out the ox

And told it to drink the water;

But the ox did not drink the water,

The water did not put out the fire,

The fire did not burn the stick,

The stick did not beat the dog,

The dog did not bite John,

John did not cut the hay

And they did not come back home.

Then the master sent out the butcher

And told him to slaughter the ox;

But the butcher did not slaughter the ox,

The ox did not drink the water,

The water did not put out the fire,

The fire did not burn the stick,

The stick did not beat the dog,

The dog did not bite John,

John did not cut the hay

And they did not come back home.

Then the master sent out the hangman

And told him to hang the butcher;

The hangman did hang the butcher,

The butcher slaughtered the ox,

The ox drank the water,

The water put out the fire,

The fire burnt the stick,

The stick beat the dog,

The dog bit John,

John cut the hay,

And they all came back home.

End of the song is very surprising. “What is this? If the hangman kills the butcher, how would that butcher kill the ox? How would the ox drink water?” - Lot of questions arise until we go back to the beginning of the song. Even after leaving those questions alone, just by understanding the gist of the poem, this is what I grasped:

If there is someone called ‘master’, there will be a worker with that master. Several types of weapons will be there. Among all those weapons, most effective

one is the 'hangman!' When the master has a hangman, all the things that the master wants will happen as he wishes. Master's world will stand after turning upside down.

In fact, what exactly does the master want? Making the worker work. That is what happens at the end of the song. That could happen, because there is a hangman.

There should be another line in the song.

After the line,

"And they all came back home."

If there is a sentence as, "master got the hay" then it will be clear as to what the master wants.

Master wants one type of 'product' or the other. A worker should work to produce it. Many weapons are needed to make the worker work! In the song, work was done because of the weapon. Master got hay without himself doing any work!

In fact, what if master himself does the work that John did? What if master cuts hay, just as John cut the hay? Then why is a stick needed? Why is a biting dog needed? Why is a hangman needed? There is no need for even one single weapon. How about John and master working together? One is not a master, and one is not a worker. How wonderful that would be!

For whom it is wonderful? It will be wonderful for John, but why would it be wonderful for the master? - There is so much meaning in it!

The nursery rhyme is very good, isn't it?

But nursery rhyme is something that little children sing. Why does the song refer to the master and the workers? Moreover it mentions a hangman! A butcher who kills an ox! - Is this the kind of words to be put in thoughts of 4 year olds? Doesn't the poet who wrote the song have that much sense? Looks like he doesn't.

This is a good song, if it is not meant for little kids. That is why Marx and Engels liked that song. They criticized it in the sense that it is satire on laws stated by the Philosophers.

At the end, John cuts the hay and brings it for the master. Don't know if the master eats the hay or feeds it to the ox! That should have been mentioned in the song.

['PHILOSOPHY: A Short Introduction' ends] ★

INDEX

A

Afanasyev 104
Ambedkar 296
Anenkov 216
Aristotle 59, 298
Aron: his critique of Marx 309
Artists: what do they do in Communist society? 258
Arts 247

B

Bacon 64
Bayle 69
Berkeley 65
Bettelheim, Charles 277
Books: why they are not comprehensible 11
Bourgeois Intellectuals: what do they say about Marx? 304
Bourgeois Mode of Production: as last antagonistic form of production 302
Bruno 17, 64

C

Calvin 17
Capital: importance of Marx's 'Capital' 288
Caste: 219; its abolition 258
Charvakas 60
Commodity production: its abolition 256
Communism: what will be after Communism? 139; its relation to Naturalism and Humanism 298; its principle in its higher phase 303
Communist consciousness: its need 288
Communist society: what changes do we find necessary 252
Consciousness 48, its relation with existence 289
Consciousness vs Universe: which is primary? 49
Contradictions 105, 111
Copernicus 63
Creationism 27
Creative Materialism: see Dialectical Materialism
Creator 40
Currier 70

D

Democritus 58
Descartes 65
Dialectical Materialism 34, 88
Dialectical Method: Marx vs Hegel 130
Dialectics: its laws 91,its first law 97; Engels on this law 101; its second law 111; its third law 115
Dictatorship of the Proletariat 229
Division of Labour: how to change it radically? 236; what did Marx & Engels say about it? 250

E

Economics: its class nature 270
Einstein, Albert 179
Epicurus 61
Epistemology: Marxist perspective 263
Exchange value: its abolition 256
Existence: its relation with consciousness 289
Exploitative culture: its abolition 258

F

Feuerbach: Engels acknowledgement of Feuerbach's influence 78; his influence

on the 'Holy Family' 81; essence of criticism of Feuerbach by Marx & Engels 84; Marx's theses on Feuerbach 85

G

Galileo 64
Gandhi: his maxim 21; 296
God: a belief, not factual 11, 40

H

Hegel: how he fascinated Marx and Engels 73; Marx's observations on Hegel 74; mistake in his arguments 94; his place in Philosophy 127; can he be the teacher of Marx 134; some of his Ideas 146; his famous quote 154
Hegel's Laws of Dialectics: why Marx & Engels liked those laws? 120; to what extent those laws are applicable to society 121
Hegelianism: is it the same as Marxism? 188
Heraclitus 57
Historical materialism 224
Hobbes 65
Holy Family: its theme 86, Lenin on its significance 87
Human beings & Earth: who existed first? 35
Human history 221
Human Nature 294
Human Servitude: Marx's observations on it 268
Human thought 35
Hume 66

I

Idea 130
Idealism 21; its origin 49; its conception of universe 50

K

Kant 69
Kapila 60
Knowledge: Marxist theory of knowledge 263

L

Labours: their gradations 243
Laplace: on Solar System 47
Lin Piao: on work 277
Locke 67
Logic: difference between Hegel's logic and Marx's logic 136
Lucretus 61

M

Madler 70
Mao: on Dialectics 196; on Socialism and Communism 202; on Quality 206
Marxism: can it be equated with Hegelianism? 188
Marxists: indifference of some Marxists toward Marxism 271
Material world 131
Materialism:what does it say? 33; its origin 48; its conception of Universe 49; its real essence 167
Matter 24, 41, 46,47
Means of Production: its confiscation 253
Mental labourers: their false consciousness about the class 281
Miletus 56
Mind 48
Money-capital: its abolition 257
Morality 259
Mosca: his critique of Marx 308

N

Natural Sciences: how they are different from Philosophy? 20

Natural substance 27
Nature:what does it consists of? 15;knowledge about it 264; real question about it 266
Negation of Negation 115
Night shift: its abolition 262

O

Opposites 105, 111

P

Perpetual Development: how illogical this conception is? 143
Philosophers: before Christ 56; of the A.D/modern times 63
Philosophy of Poverty 214
Philosophy: why it is a boring subject? 14;how it is different from Natural sciences 20; is it a Science? 22; is it necessary? 155; some time-pass theories 180; its class nature 270; contradictory philosophies 293; is it worthwhile to spend time on it? 311
Plato 59
Political Economy: how it treats property? 293
Popper: his critique of Marx 308
Poverty of Philosophy 214
Productive Forces 255
Proletarian Dictatorship 229
Proletariat: its muck of all ages; its ignorance about Nature and Society 278-9; influence of the ruling class ideas on it 280; its good quality 283; attitudes of different sections of the working class toward each other 284
Property: its connection with Division of Labour, its forms 225
Proudhon 214
Ptolemy 63

Q

Quality into Quantity 98
Quality: what does it mean? 206
Quantity into Quality 98

R

Religion: its abolition 258

S

Schweitzer 217
Selfishness: wrong conception about it 294
Servetus 17
Shankara 61
Society: knowledge about it 265; important questions about it 267
Soul 48
Space and Time 173
Spinoza 65
Stalin: on Dialectics 192
State: end of its rule 261; its transformation in Communist society 299

T

Thing 27
Thought 48
Time and Space 173

U

Universe vs Consciousness: which is primary? 49
Universe: can we understand it? 35, 48
Use-value perspective 240

V

Value calculation: their abolition 257
Value perspective 239
Vinoba Bhave 297

W

Wage system: its abolition 259
Wolf 55
Working Class consciousness: its aim 300

★